THE NEW IDEAL.

VOL. III. JULY—AUGUST, 1890. NOS. 7–8.

REPORT OF THE TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION.

The Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the Free Religious Association was held in Tremont Temple, Boston, on Wednesday and Thursday, May 28 and 29, 1890. The President, William J. Potter, presided, and called the Convention to order,—speaking as follows:

OPENING ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT POTTER.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Friends and Members of the Free Religious Association:

Again we have been summoned for our Annual Meeting. It is commonly supposed that the Free Religious Association observes none of the traditions of the elders; yet for the twenty-three years of its existence it has always observed one tradition, and that is to hold its Annual Convention on Friday of Anniversary Week; but this year the Association has violated one of its own traditions and you are called together on Wednesday. This, however, is not so much a matter of choice as of necessity. We found this hall pre-engaged for Friday, which is, as you know, Decoration Day. The soldiers, the veterans of the Union army, are to have a Memorial Celebration here on that day; and hence by anticipation these flags and these colors decorate the hall, giving their glory to all the various meetings that may be held here before Memorial Day.

This necessity of taking a different day will, I fear, somewhat detract from the attendance at our meetings, and it has introduced considerable difficulty in fixing the programme. We found various interferences, here and there, with other conventions and meetings, which many of our members would gladly attend; and a good many who have been in the habit of coming to this gathering of ours may find their first choice somewhere else to-day. Under these circumstances, this large assembly gives very gratifying

evidence of the interest taken in this Convention. But our greatest difficulty was in fixing the time for the Festival. That has usually been the crowning event of our Annual Meeting. We have usually had our Business Meeting on Thursday evening, our Convention for discussion during the day-time of Friday, and then we have capped the whole with the Festival on Friday evening. Now we have to scatter our meetings through two days. Our Business Meeting is fixed for to-morrow at three o'clock, and the Festival for to-morrow evening; for we could not interfere in any way, or attempt to compete, with the Woman Suffrage Festival, which is to be held this evening. Our only alternative was to compete with the Woman Suffragists or with the Unitarian Festival, and we chose the latter. Our friends to-morrow evening, therefore, will have the fine dilemma of choosing for their Festival the Free Religious Association or the Unitarian Association. They will get perhaps the better dinner at the Unitarian Festival, but I am not so sure about the intellectual repast. Of that you must judge for yourselves.

With these preliminary remarks concerning business arrangements, I have a few more general observations to make before we begin the discussion that is to occupy your attention this morning. We meet to-day, friends, under clear skies that are auspicious. The material heavens are bright over our heads. When I look up into the blue sky on such a morning as this, I cannot count it any very great sin that our Aryan ancestors in India, thousands of years ago, worshiped the sky as their symbol of supremest deity. It is to me, indeed, a grander symbol in many respects than was the great, gigantic, patriarchal, and monarchical Power, supposed to be enthroned above the skies, but acting very arbitrarily and with very human or inhuman passions at times, which the Hebrews have given to the world. The Hebrews have gone beyond that view now, and all of us are coming to the larger conception, even though it be somewhat more vague,— more vague because it approaches more nearly the Infinite,— of a supreme power working in the world, everywhere and eternally, and working for righteousness. Let it, then, be a good omen that we meet to-day under bright skies.

It is, however, a happier omen, that we meet under spiritual skies, if I may so speak, which are even more auspicious. The progress of the religious world and of the secular world (and the two are coming together so that we cannot now very distinctly draw the line between them) is something wonderful. The progress of material science to-day, with all its marvelous doings, its grand discoveries, its revolutionizing tendencies, is not so great as is the progress which is taking place in the religious views of the world.

I have been of late particularly reminded of this fact in attending the recent gathering of the Western Unitarian Conference, where a memorial meeting in honor of Theodore Parker was held. I well remember the time (it is only a little more than thirty years ago) when the great preacher at Music Hall on account of his broken health was exiled across the Atlantic, and at a gathering of the alumni of Cambridge Divinity School, of which he was a regular member, a resolution of sympathy was introduced for him. It was merely the sending of a fraternal message of sympathy to him in his disabled condition, and contained not a word of endorsement of his particular theological views. But that resolution was vigorously opposed, and voted down by a large majority. Our friend Moncure D. Conway, who introduced it, earnestly pleaded for the resolution, and there were a few of the younger members of the denomination, and of those who were still in the Cambridge Divinity School preparing for the ministry, who sympathized strongly with its object. Some of us were sitting in the back seats of the College Chapel where this gathering was held, and I well remember how one of the most distinguished Doctors of Divinity of the denomination, in opposing that resolution, turned around facing these seats where Mr. Parker's disciples and sympathizers were supposed to be sitting, and declared, "It is time that these younger men who are the disciples of Theodore Parker's rationalistic theology should understand that we do not want them among us, that the denomination does not want them." And the resolution was voted down in that spirit. That was the Unitarianism of thirty years ago.

To-day Theodore Parker's portrait graces the Channing Building of the Unitarians on Beacon street, a volume of extracts from his writings is issued by the American Unitarian Association, and the Parker Memorial Building in Boston has been taken by the Fraternity of Unitarian Churches in this city on the fairly understood and expressed condition that it should be kept as a memorial to Theodore Parker for all time, they using it for purposes which should be clearly in the line of Mr. Parker's work. And now, to crown all, the Western Unitarian Conference holds a Memorial Meeting for Theodore Parker in this thirtieth Anniversary year since his death. We may say, therefore, with regard to Unitarians to-day,—I speak not of those who may seem to be in the advance of that denomination, but of the average Unitarian,—that they have come up to the position which Theodore Parker held in theology. We may say that Theodore Parker, among theological reformers, has the rare felicity to have converted, within less than a generation after his death, the denomination which in his life sent him into exile as a heretic. [*Applause.*]

And when we look into other denominations, into their condition, into the elements of progress among them, there are certainly signs of promise in the skies. There are a good many of the denominations that are to-day in the hopeful condition happily characterized by Ralph Waldo Emerson as complaining that they do not hold the opinions they are charged with. In order to get out of that embarrassing position, the Presbyterian denomination, as you know, is about to revise its time-worn creed, two-thirds of the Presbyterians represented in the Assembly which last night adjourned at Saratoga having there voted for a creed-revision. If the Presbyterians are moving forward, the Orthodox Congregationalists cannot remain long in the rear. The Board of Foreign Missions, that great Board which seems to be the last body to be moved, will, I apprehend, before very long have its last consolation taken from it,— the consolation of believing that, whatever may happen in the domain of Christendom in the infinite future, the most of the heathen are to be damned. I believe that they will not much longer have the comfort of believing even that. [*Laughter.*]

We hear, too, of the conservative and æsthetic Episcopal body moving forward. That church is agitated as to the revision of its prayer-book,— moving very slowly, but yet moving; and there are ministers in that church who are preaching very much the same kind of views that we have heard on this platform and from some of the representatives of the Free Religious Association. Mr. Conway has reported that he heard recently from Phillips Brooks in Boston a sermon that, considering its breadth of religious vision and its fine humanitarian spirit, might have come from the mouth of Theodore Parker. And Heber Newton, you know, has been heard with pleasure among us at our annual gatherings, and on our lecture platforms; and he does not speak here among us what he does not say to his people in New York. The time must be approaching when such a giant in the pulpit as Phillips Brooks will not have to appeal pleadingly to the Episcopal General Convention, as he did last year, to be allowed to read one chapter of the Old Testament at his Sunday service in Trinity church in preference to another. To most of us such a matter may seem a very trifling thing for a great Christian body to discuss, but it will be a sign of progress when the traditional order for worship shall be so far broken in Episcopal churches as to allow an individual minister a privilege of that kind.

Then if I were to speak of the Ethical Culture movement, —outside of the churches but still representing a very important element in the religious progress of the time,— I should have a further view of the condition of things to

present to you which would be very encouraging. The Ethical Culture societies are strengthening their position and preparing to advance to new fields and new work. Thus everywhere, and especially if we review the field of social and humanitarian problems, we find the skies propitious for us in their signs of promise. I think there has never been a time, indeed, I know there has not, when such multitudes of people were aroused to the need of doing something in the spirit of the old Golden Rule for the laboring classes, and for all the needy classes of our population, as to-day. The churches are beginning to vie with each other in humanitarian work. The Social Science Associations, the Associated Charities organizations,—the various philanthropic societies,—all these are working in the direction of a wiser and a finer development of the humanitarian spirit, and are stimulating the churches themselves to the same kind of effort; so that those Liberals who are unchurched will soon be in the rear if they do not arouse themselves to the problems of the hour that are crying for a solution,—these social problems that are all alive in the atmosphere around us.

And this point brings me to the special subject of our discussion this morning. Last year we brought here in the regular programme the consideration of the social problem in various interesting aspects. Mr. Bellamy made his earnest plea for "Nationalism." "Christian Socialism," "Individualism," "Profit-sharing," each was ably represented by a special advocate. This year we have taken a somewhat different course, though the subject in its general breadth covers the same great question. There are those among us who do not agree, at least hesitate to believe, that any solution presented by the various social schemes of the day is to be the one panacea for all the ills and evils of the human lot. There are some of us who think that in these special schemes of amelioration there are certain important moral and personal factors that have been omitted from the problem; that, after all, a good deal of educational work, and particularly of personal moral education, is to be done before any large number of individuals will be prepared for the millennium; and we bring to-day a subject that is to cover this special aspect of the theme,—the Moral and Personal efforts needed in Social Reform. We are very happy to have secured, for the opening of this grand theme, Francis Ellingwood Abbot, one of the founders and for many years a co-adjutator in the work of the Free Religious Association. We re-welcome him here this morning with his ripened thought on this important subject, "Moral Education and Personal Work as Factors in Social Reform." I now have the great pleasure of introducing to you, Francis Ellingwood Abbot. [*Applause.*]

ADDRESS OF FRANCIS E. ABBOT, Ph.D.

MORAL EDUCATION AND PERSONAL EFFORT AS FACTORS OF SOCIAL REFORM.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The subject on which I have been invited to address you this morning is: "Moral Education and Personal Effort as Factors of Social Reform." It is a large, profound, and supremely important subject. I know not who phrased it, but the phrasing lends itself admirably to convictions which have been slowly shaping themselves in my own mind for thirty years, and I propose to adhere to it with more than usual closeness.

Moral education is what society *owes* to every individual; personal effort is what every individual *owes* to society; if these sacred debts are paid, social reform results. On the one hand, self-devotion of society to the highest welfare of the individual: on the other hand, self-devotion of the individual to the highest welfare of society; given these, there follows the highest possible evolution of both. That is the law of life in every organism, and humanity is *one organic being.* In this thought lies implicit all that I have to say to you; it only needs to be drawn out, unfolded, evolved.

You will pardon me, I trust, if I begin with rather copious extracts from an essay of my own on "Organization," published in Morse's *Radical* of December, 1866,—long enough ago to be quite forgotten. Yet, to all who are interested in the Free Religious Association, it may possess some historic interest, quite independent of any other; for it was the very earliest public appeal for organization of the new movement, in that ferment of thought, enthusiasm, and hope for humanity which eventuated in the founding of your own society, and shows that the earliest dream of its proper mission was that of a concentration of all "personal effort" towards the "moral education" of the *world,* and practical realization of the moral ideal in society and individual alike. Disappointed ten years ago because this early dream of a great work to do for the moral education of the world seemed partly lost in attention to precedents and technicalities, I silently retired to work for it in other ways. Now, in cheerful obedience to your call, I return to the old familiar platform to plead for that early dream once more. And I cannot plead for it better than in these long-forgotten words on

"ORGANIZATION."

"The difference between organic and inorganic being is the difference between life and lifelessness. It is a law of the strictest universality that all finite life must become organic.

"The lowest phase of being in which life becomes [individually] apparent is the cell; and the cell is an organism. In such plants as the *Algæ*, the *Protococcus nivalis* (Red-snow Plant), and so forth, vegetation is reduced to its lowest terms, for here the entire plant is nothing but a cell. From this rudest beginning up to its culmination in man, life rises in power and intensity by becoming more and more complex in cellular structure, by multiplying organs, by assuming more and more sharply defined forms. Man is the first of animals because he is the most highly organized. The place of each species in the scale of existence is assigned solely according to the greater or less complexity of its organization. Hence it is a second law of equal universality that finite life is higher in degree, the more highly organic it becomes.

"Organization, then, is the self-expression of living force, the result and the proof of vitality. This is true in a far higher sense than the merely botanical or physiological. The plant is a composite being; so is humanity. The most profoundly philosophical view of human society is that which makes the race an organism. Pure individualism is the crudest type of human existence. Thoreau, in his hut by Walden Pond, is a specimen on a higher level of the one-celled plant, or would be so, if he had not got into his head, before he went there, what never grew in the woods. Caspar Hauser in his dungeon is a better specimen of what pure individualism produces. As the world goes, however, pure individualism is impossible, and all who affect it only exhibit greater or less amounts of necessary inconsistency. It is idle to cry out against organization; every man, by being born into a family, a neighborhood, a town, a county, a state, a nation, is born into organizations like a nest of boxes. In fact, every man is an organization himself, and can only escape the necessity of being one by dying and decomposing with the utmost speed. Sociology, as a science, rests wholly on this conception of the human race as a vast organism of which individuals are component parts; its laws and principles are valid only on the presupposition of a vital, organic connection among these parts. Paul seized an important scientific truth, when he declared that we are all 'members of one body.' It does not depend in the slightest degree upon our private choice, therefore, whether we shall belong to organizations or not. Willing or unwilling, we are organized in many ways at our birth, and cannot get disorganized before our death; we must make the best of it as it is.

"Now the great problem of sociology is the right adadjustment of the relations between the unit and the aggregate, the part and the whole, the individual and society. Neither war, according to Hobbes, nor savage isolation,

according to Rousseau, is the 'state of nature'; but, these being excluded, only one alternative remains, and that is co-operation. The state of nature is mutual co-operation, which is the [moral] ideal of society. But co-operation implies a common end for which all co-operate; and what is that? This is a most important question, and the answer to it will effect essentially the character of every voluntary organization into which men enter.

"The ideal end of society is accomplished in the highest possible development of all its individual members, according to the law of their natural individualities. The individual cannot develop in isolation, independently of social helps; and that is the sufficient answer to the advocate of pure individualism. From birth to death, men are dependent on each other in countless ways; there is no such thing as human independence, except in a very Pickwickian sense. *The completest possible education of all its individuals, their most perfect development in all directions, is the grand end and function of society.* This end attained, the highest welfare of all is secured in the highest welfare of each. It is the duty of society to propose this end: it is the duty of the individual to co-operate in achieving it. . . . . Private culture and public usefulness are thus reciprocally ends and means: the highest individual culture is impossible unless dedicated to public uses, and the highest usefulness to society is impossible except through the most perfect culture of the individual. This mutual existence of the individual for society, and of society for the individual, constitutes the human race a single organism, which the immortal Kant defines as 'that in which the whole and the parts are mutually means and ends.' The more highly society becomes thus organized, the richer, freer, and grander is each individual life. Let society and the individual be faithful in the performance of these reciprocal duties, and the greatest of human triumphs is achieved — *liberty in union,* the unimpeded evolution of every soul according to the Divine ideal implanted in it, and the harmonious working of all souls for the highest good of each. Is not this the true idea of the kingdom of God? . . . .

"Least of all, then, should the liberal preacher of to-day look askance on organization. For what is he preaching? Clearly, for *reform,*— political, social, religious. But he who works for *re-form* must first believe in *form* — and form is organization. The modern prophet of humanity aims, not to *disorganize* society (though often falsely accused of that), but only to *re-organize* it on the basis of love, righteousness, and truth. He can only aim to correct the wrong basis of present organization; he protests against every organization which represses individuality, but only in

favor of organization which shall develop it. Disorganization is simple anarchy, social death. Scrutinize, therefore, the fundamental principles of social organizations as severely as you will; but do not defeat your own end by destroying what you seek to reform. Let every new organization be helped and encouraged which shall tend to accomplish the genuine object of all organizations, namely, the higher development [that is, the education] of the individual. That is the touchstone, the test, of all beneficial organization. Individual development need not be the direct object proposed; but, if it is not the ultimate object attained, if it is in any way, shape, or manner interfered with, then the organization, no matter how dazzling its professions, or philanthropic its intentions, obstructs the genuine progress of society, and should be either reformed or abolished. If reform is impossible, there is no remedy but abolition. . . . .

"It is time for a new organization, on a new basis. It is useless to organize on intellectual finalities, for thinking men always outgrow, sooner or later, their own thought, and the truth of to-day may become, by its very halfness, the falsity of to-morrow. . . . The only bond of union elastic enough to leave free play for individual growth must be a platform of principles that are laws of life, of purposes and ends that are life itself. A basis such as this will be a new experiment in the history of religious organizations. It will be more than the simple affirmation of freedom, for that is a mere negation, an absence of restrictions, a necessary condition of growth, but not growth itself. It will be the affirmation of *progress* as the law of humanity — development, evolution, ascent from the lower to the higher. The law of boundless progress as our governing principle, and the fact of ceaseless progress as our practical end, will constitute a basis of union broad as humanity itself. If we can discover such a statement of it as will commend itself to the minds of our isolated liberals, it will help the world not a little to put forth a collective affirmation of it in some free manner. I cannot but think that this has become the solemn duty of the hour. With this belief, I would submit the following sketch of a Constitution to the thoughtful consideration of the reader. Take it for what it is worth; but, if this is bad, put a better in its place.

"PREAMBLE. *Whereas*, the grand end of human society is the freest, fullest, and highest development of the individual, and the special end of every minor organization should be in harmony with, and in furtherance of, this general end of society itself; and

"*Whereas*, The grand end of the individual soul is the realization, in itself and in the world, of the highest Ideal of Humanity, and is thus identical with the great cause of universal human progress: —

"ARTICLE I. Therefore, we hereby associate ourselves into a

Free Brotherhood, for the purpose of helping each other and our fellowmen in the endeavor after the perfect Spirit, Life, and Truth.

"ARTICLE II. The only condition of fellowship shall be sympathy with our purpose, and willingness to co-operate in it. . . . .

"Is it indeed a Utopian scheme, a dreamer's fantasy, to look for such a brotherhood as this? I cannot believe it. Yet even to fail in such an attempt would be grander than any common success. If the kingdom of God is anything but a mocking mirage, it must come in some such guise as this. Must we wait forever, or can we begin it here and now?"

Such, friends and comrades, was that early dream — the earliest public attempt to give organic and living form to a movement which in itself was quite formless and blind, but which at last took shape in the Free Religious Association. Let me frankly confess it, the attempt proved a failure; the dream remains still only a dream. But that is only to say in other words that the dream was the social ideal itself — for the ideal flies ever in advance of the real. Yet all progress lies in realizing the ideal, notwithstanding; and the first, all-essential step towards even a partial realization of it is to comprehend it. It will not, then, be useless to point out that the dream-ideal I have just held up before you (alas, in a manner how unworthy of its surpassing, eternal, inexpressible beauty!) is itself the solution of the problem now set to be solved — the problem of determining the right relation of moral education and personal effort as factors of social reform. For that dream-ideal shows us that social reform, or, better still, the *continuous self-formation of human society in the strict line of natural evolution*, can come to pass only under two great ethical conditions: —

I. The supreme duty of society is combined effort towards the moral education of the individual.

II. The supreme duty of the individual is personal effort towards the moral education of society itself.

Let me dwell a moment on these principles, and show very briefly their rational grounds.

The essential constitution of every organism, as I have elsewhere shown at length, is that of a *self-making and self-working natural machine;** for Nature is no external creator, but creates the organism by forces and laws which are immanent in the organism itself and operate from within. As an organism, therefore, society makes and works itself, both as one whole and as many parts.

On the one hand, *society as a whole creates its own individuals, and moral education is only the necessary completion of its own creative work.* The individual is

* "The Way Out of Agnosticism," §§ 39–48.

never born from an individual, but always from the union of two individuals in the family; and the family is the social unit, the social molecule, or society itself reduced to its lowest terms. It is for this reason that the family, itself a natural institution founded on the universal distinction of sex, becomes necessarily, as society emerges out of barbarism, the fundamental social institution, and ought to be regarded also as the fundamental moral institution of the human world. It is for the same reason that society, if the parents fail in their immediate duty to the young individual, is bound to make good their place, so far as possible; and this fundamental obligation of society is recognized everywhere in civilized lands. Just so far as society becomes civilized, and learns to comprehend the moral obligations involved in its own constitution as an organism of persons, it recognizes its duty towards the young individual it has created, and continues its fostering care until its own long and slow work of creation is completed in the young individual's full maturity. This is possible only in his moral maturity; all other education is subordinate and introductory to that moral education which teaches us how to live aright. Briefly, then, the duty which society owes to every individual culminates in the duty of giving him a moral education; for society makes him an individual, and is bound to do its own work faithfully by teaching him how to make himself a good individual.

On the other hand, *all individuals, as many parts, create society itself as one whole, and moral education is only the completion of their own creative work.* Society is nothing but what its own members make it; its collective action and influence, however distinct from the action and influence of any one member, are the direct resultant of the actions and influences of all its members. Each individual, therefore, counts for one in determining the moral quality of all social action and influence, and is bound to make it as good as possible. The highest use to which he can put the moral education he has himself received is to better the instruction, and reciprocate the service by helping to educate society itself to still higher and nobler ideals. That is, the duty which the individual owes to society culminates in the duty of making society more highly moral still through his own personal effort, and of giving back ten, five, or at least two talents for the one which he has received in trust.

Thus we see how the reciprocity of obligation between society and the individual rests upon their natural and necessary organic relation as *reciprocal creators one of the other.* No ignorance, no misconception, no wilfulness, no selfishness, no indifference, can repeal this natural law or

suspend its operation for a single instant; the reciprocal duty is there, in the very nature of things, and the infinite universe itself is the source, the sanction, and the enforcer of it. If this reciprocal duty is violated, if either society or the individual in any way neglects it or disobeys it, it avenges itself with all the inexorability of natural law, and inflicts upon the social organism the natural penalty of disease or death. But out of intelligent, willing, and noble obedience to it springs all social reform, all social growth, all social health and happiness. Our social perplexities, diseases, miseries, are all results of our own ignorance or disregard of the fundamental law of our own social existence: namely, that society shall expend its utmost energy in making its own individuals free, intelligent, and virtuous individuals, and that every individual in turn shall expend his or her utmost energy in making society itself a free, intelligent and virtuous society. In one word, the highest duty of both alike is reciprocal moral education; for this is simply the reciprocal devotion of each to the highest ideal welfare of the other.

In yonder Public Garden, glorious with all the intoxicating beauty of the Spring, we may easily learn, if we will, the lesson of the loftiest and most spiritual ethics. Out of the seed buried in the ground, the young plant creates itself from within by absorbing, assimilating, and devoting to its own self-evolving form all the rich materials of growth which Nature and Man lavish upon it; and this self-creative process of evolution it steadily pursues until it has attained its own maturity. But does it end there? Far from it. No sooner has it reached the stage of completed growth, than forthwith it proceeds to devote itself to the species from which it sprang. It flowers — and why? Simply to produce the seed of new plants like itself, and thereby to fulfil the highest end of its own being by reproducing, continuing, and advancing its own kind. Here we behold the working of the two supreme and universal principles of the whole organic world — *Self-Evolution* and *Self-Devotion*, each for the sake of the other; and the harmonious co-working of these two principles is *Life itself*.

Now these same two principles, carried up into the higher world of spiritual consciousness and moral life, manifest themselves as the higher principles of *Egoism* and *Altruism* — life for self and life for other selves. We are all moral beings simply because we are all in the first place organic beings; the supreme principles of our moral nature are developed out of our organic nature; our moral life is simply the higher development of our organic life, and all the diseases of our moral life arise out of the failure to preserve and realize the true balance, the profound and beautiful harmony, of these two fundamental moral principles,

Egoism and Altruism. To live for self alone, in complete neglect of our obligations to others, is pure *selfishness*; to live for others alone, in complete neglect of our obligations to ourselves, would be pure *selflessness*: the only purely moral life is to live for both, in due proportion, balance, and harmony of Egoism and Altruism in a unity which is at once organic and spiritual. Yet nothing is harder to achieve, or rarer to find, than practical realization of this harmony of complementary principles, whether in human thought or in human action. It is only the equilibrium of centripetal and centrifugal forces which preserves the existence of the solar system; it is only the equilibrium of Egoism and Altruism which renders possible the existence of a true social system; and all the troubles of our social state are the natural and inevitable consequences of ignorance or disregard of this fundamental condition of all society. Hence we see the principle of Egoism on the one hand, carried out one-sidedly and injuriously into the extreme of mere individualism, anarchism, or *laissez-faire*; and the principle of Altruism, on the other hand, carried out no less one-sidedly and injuriously into the extreme of mere Communism, Socialism, or Nationalism. Doubtless, in the long run, these extremes will neutralize each other, and society will at last learn to find its true health and happiness in universal moral education, brought about by the combined personal efforts of individuals towards the higher organic and moral unity of society itself.

How to secure this universal moral education, not at all as a substitute for other kinds of education, such as physical, manual, industrial, intellectual, but rather as the completion of all other training in practical mastery of the art of living aright, is in truth the most pressing practical question of our time. The gravest difficulty lies in the fact that the world has no adequate idea of the magnitude of its own obligation to the *child*. What more can society do for the individual than to make him? That is what society does in the birth of every child. Yet what greater wrong can society do to the individual than to leave him only half made? That is what society does when it leaves the individual morally uneducated. The child is born into the right to live, and society recognizes this right by making it murder to kill him. But the child is also born into the right of being taught how to live; and society tramples on this right in thousands and thousands of cases, by leaving the little ones to grow up from the beginning in ignorance, misery, and crime. It is every man's concern, it is your concern and my concern, that no child shall be thus heartlessly and most foully wronged. Parents are, at bottom, only trustees for society itself; and, if by reason of their own ignorance or misfortune or vice, they are unable to

discharge the sacred obligations of their trusteeship, then society itself is bound to discharge those sacred obligations, and defend both itself and the child from the consequences of an immoral education. These truths are dimly felt by many, but they are clearly seen by few; and, perhaps, all that we can now do in the matter is to utter them and spread them as widely as we may. For universal moral education can never be realized in the world, until the world first gets an adequate idea of the magnitude of its own obligation to the child — until it comes to understand that it is fundamentally immoral, unjust, and cruel, to make the individual at all, if, by leaving him morally uneducated, it leaves him only half made at last.

But society is not a metaphysical entity, nor yet an abstraction of any sort; it is not even a "national individual," but simply a great multitude of personal individuals, organized by Nature as the human race on the basis of the family as the social unit, and organized by man himself as many nations or states on the basis of the individual as the political unit. Whatever society does must be done through the combined efforts of individuals; and whatever is left undone by individuals, through neglect to combine their personal efforts to one and the same end, will be left undone by society as a whole. The energy, the intelligence, the moral worth of the individual, therefore, is the foundation of all human activity; and nothing in the way of social action can possibly rise above the level of the average energy, intelligence, and moral worth of the individuals who compose the community itself. Political equality of all men before the law, which is too imperfect to be able to take cognizance of their individual differences beyond certain obvious limits, is the necessary foundation of the free State; but there is and can be no social equality of all men, so long as Nature makes them unequal in their inherent energy, intelligence, and moral capacity. Hence the main responsibility for raising the standard of moral education in society itself must rest upon those who, in the existing inequality of things, have been so fortunate as to be morally educated above the average level. In their clearness of moral insight, in their strength of moral conviction, in their singleness of heart and devotedness to the common weal, lies the hope of the world, the possibility of social reform. Personal effort, then, implying as it does definite intellectual ideas, definite moral ideals, and definite spiritual sentiments, is the very culmination of the moral life; and, taken with these necessary and obvious presuppositions, personal effort is the essence of all real religion that is likely to retain or deserve the lasting veneration of mankind. "Religion is the effort of Man to perfect himself" — that was the very first sentence in the very first

issue of *The Index*, twenty years ago; and, as the context showed, it meant the effort of the individual and of society alike to realize the moral ideal in the world, as universal truth, righteousness, and love. No man will, or can, make such personal effort as that, who has not learned already that the whole universe is pledged, by its own inherent constitution, and by its own self-revealed nature, to be eternally on the side of truth, righteousness, and love. Call it by what name you will, such a universe as that is inherently moral, personal, spiritual, divine. Just so long as the course of Nature tends steadily and irresistibly towards the evolution of good out of evil, just so long will every man who has learned how to think, and to trust the power of thought, know that his own active effort to perfect our human world is the only possible way to be deeply religious — the only possible way to be in harmony with the eternal effort of God's world of Nature to perfect itself. That effort of Nature to perfect itself is Evolution — and Evolution is God's own religion, his patient, calm, eternal pursuit of his own Divine Ideal. Only by entering with large intelligence, indomitable will, and unconquerable loyalty into this self-consecration of the universe to moral good can any man be truly moral or deeply religious; and, for him, the place to begin is the place where he stands — this human world of ours, with all its sufferings, sorrows, and sins. To illumine this human world with the radiance of higher truth, to inspire it with the passion for purer righteousness, to divinize it with the spirit of a tenderer love, to console it with visions of a rational and more glorious hope,— this is to educate society in morality, and this alone. Truth, righteousness, love, hope,— is there aught else worthy of serious or continuous effort? Or aught else capable of rendering life worth living? Or aught else that by any possibility could be the seed of social reform? If not, then these things are the essence of all morality and the soul of all religion; to elevate the world to supreme veneration for them is the aim of all moral education; and to establish them in the world as its organic law is the aim of all high personal effort. For Nature has but one command to each and every soul: "Friend, go up higher!"

> Beneath the juniper the prophet old,
> By Beer-sheba (so runs the Hebrew tale),
> Sat in the wilderness. Of what avail
> His service of Jehovah, long and bold,
> Denouncing lukewarm love and worship cold,
> His zealous slaying of the priests of Baal,
> His stern rebuke of royal Ahab pale?
> He hid his face within his garment's fold.
> What mourned he? Not the loss of life's reward,
> Not lack of lands or gold or finery,

Not peril of fierce Jezebel's bloody sword :
Out from his soul burst forth this bitter cry—
"I am not better than my fathers, Lord !
I am not better than my fathers ! Let me die !"

O mighty lesson, vast, magnificent !
The ancient legend fires the blood like wine ;
It bears a truth more precious, grand, divine,
Than ever poet sang or prophet meant,
A truth with Nature's holiest hymnings blent.
BE BETTER THAN THY FATHERS ! By that sign,
The world moves on in Evolution's line,
Quenching the soul that drones in self-content.
Wilt thou not life with nobler deeds adorn,
Thou art no child of theirs, the fathers leal.
To aspire, to climb, is every spirit born :
Thou canst not live on nothing but the Real—
Thou canst not eat the husk and spurn the corn :
Die shalt thou, liv'st thou not by God's Divine Ideal.

And thou, my country, thou must higher build
The rising temple which is but begun.
Not yet with destined splendor can the sun
Thy spires and pinnacles and turrets gild ;
Not yet is thy grand destiny fulfilled,
Not yet thy race of high achievement run,
Not yet thy goal of dazzling glory won :
The voice of God's Ideal is not stilled.
'Tis thine to build upon the fathers' plan,
Yet give it loftier aims and vaster scope,—
Thine in the world's great march to lead the van,
And guide to light all who in darkness grope ;
For thou art consecrate to God, to man,
To Freedom, Justice, Love, to Gratitude, to Hope !

THE PRESIDENT : After this clear-cut presentation of the principles of the topic which Dr. Abbot has given us, the discussion will proceed by several addresses bringing before us certain practical methods illustrating the topic ; and our platform is enriched for this discussion particularly by two voices from across the Atlantic. You will soon have the pleasure of listening to them. First I shall call upon Mr. Percival Chubb of London, who is to give us, from his own observation and knowledge, some account of the Arnold Toynbee Hall in London. After his address a collection will be taken for the objects of the Association, and while it is being taken the organ will be played. Directly following, Mrs. Laura Ormiston Chant of London will address you on the same topic, illustrating it with incidents which are familiar to her. Then we shall have addresses from our home talent. Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones of Chicago will speak, and Mr. Frederic A. Hinckley will close the morning meeting. I now present to you Mr. Percival Chubb of England. [*Applause.*]

ADDRESS OF MR. PERCIVAL CHUBB.

ARNOLD TOYNBEE; OR PERSONAL INFLUENCE IN SOCIAL REFORM.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I consider it a very great privilege and a great honor to be asked to say a few words on this platform during the course of this meeting of the Free Religious Association, especially when I remember that the platform of this Association has in former times been graced by one who, to many of us of the younger generation in England, appears as a great master — perhaps the greatest modern master — of spiritual vision. For, if many of us in England know what Free Religion means, if any of us have been able to steer a little clearer than we might otherwise have done off from the sands of barren negations on the one hand, and from superstition on the other, I think I may say it is due to Ralph Waldo Emerson more than anybody else. [*Applause.*] But our tribute to Emerson is not limited to his spiritual or religious influence. We have also learned much from him upon social topics. If we have read his essays on "Spiritual Laws" and "Compensation" with great eagerness, we have also read with equally great eagerness his essay upon "Man the Reformer"; and if many of us to-day are greater rebels and sometimes a little more explosive than seems fitting to many people, it must be laid partly to the door of Emerson.

But I have been asked to say this morning a few words upon a man in England who has also been a great influence in social directions, and who will illustrate how great may be a personal influence in this matter of Social Reform. Arnold Toynbee, a man of fine university education, a man of very refined nature, and yet withal a man of the people, a man loving the people, and a man loved by the people, spent the latter years of his life in working for the people, and came to his death by his enthusiastic devotion to the cause of the people. And I am pleased to think that Toynbee may be cited as a happy instance of the importance of the personal factor in Social Reform, because he was what may certainly be called a very religious character. He was pervaded by religious sentiment; he felt that life was indeed a very great and serious thing to us all, and not to be lived on the surface. But, also, Arnold Toynbee may be cited as being, I think, representative of a type of men who have since become more numerous in our social movement in England. It is one of the great blessings of our social movement to-day that it has working in it a number of young men who, like Arnold Toynbee, are men from the universities, of fine educational advantages; who are not mere rhetoricians, but who have devoted themselves to earnest study of social problems; therefore in speaking of Arnold Toynbee I am not citing a peculiar case, but one

which has its counterpart in the social movement at the present time. Indeed, some of you may not be aware that the Socialist Movement of London is largely officered by a group of these young men, who have had exceptional educational advantages, and, like Toynbee, recognize that greater opportunities to aid their less fortunate brethren bring a greater responsibility. Arnold Toynbee had his religious and moral sides, and he was not able to separate the two. His point of view was very well expressed in a sentence in which he said that "any attempts in religious reform must go along with attempts at social reform," and he worked consistently upon that basis. It was this stand that another great social reformer, Mazzini, took when he said, "Every social problem is becoming a religious problem."

Toynbee's work will show his earnestness on this view. He was a devoted economist at Oxford, and his enthusiasm drew around him a number of his colleagues, who with him devoted themselves very sedulously to the study of economic problems. Many of them have been distinguished by the contributions they have made towards the solution of the problems. But the largest monument to Toynbee's influence, as your Chairman reminded you, is that institution in London known as Toynbee Hall. Toynbee Hall is perhaps less known amongst you now than it was a couple of years ago. Since I have been in this country I have seen many accounts of the work going on there, and perhaps I need not be more specific as to what that work is. It is mainly an educational centre where reformers of all kinds meet together; a sort of arena for the frank and friendly discussion of social problems. A great deal has been done to lessen the bitterness felt between men of different schools in England. Toynbee Hall is mainly an educational institution, where young men from the universities reside. Many of those who come to London in order to pursue a profession reside there, and give their evenings, and leisure generally, to work connected with the institution. A very great deal has been done there. It was not started under Toynbee's own personal influence, although it was the outcome of the influence which he exerted at Oxford. The real originator of the scheme was the present Warden of Toynbee Hall, Rev. Samuel Barnet, of East London, who has done a great deal of work in that locality.

But, perhaps more important than this, Toynbee Hall is an instance of the marked influence of a man, through his own views and teachings, with regard to the moral factors in social reform. Toynbee was one of those men who insist that we must moralize our economics; that we must in England break away from the *laissez-faire* tradition as to economics. When he began to write, the old *laissez-faire* notions had been very much strengthened by the doctrine of Evolution. It was supposed that the only way out of our present misery was through struggle: we must allow the present

struggle to go on, must allow the fittest to survive and the weakest to be eliminated. And that teaching had the effect of paralyzing for a time all hearty effort at social reform. Toynbee felt the weight of this view, or of what he called "this conception of the reign of law," very keenly indeed; and it was his great endeavor to do something to turn back the tide which was making against social reform in this direction. He maintained, of course, that man did not belong to the mere brute evolution of the world; that it was possible for him, if he would, to create and build up a new and thoroughly human world instead of allowing the mere brute forces to have their sway: and accordingly he pleaded all along for co-operation as against conflict. He pleaded that men should henceforth endeavor to do what they could, by not allowing things blindly to take their way, but by seizing on the actual forces of the time and moulding them in accordance with some broad human ideal. It was this moral view of his that made him such a power amongst his colleagues and amongst the workingmen of England. Toynbee believed that we could, if we would, uprear a society which should be in accordance with the highest social dream of man; and I think he has been one of the greatest influences in this direction,—in mitigating that old economic view, the old *laissez-faire* view, and bringing forward that view which we may now call the Social view, or Socialistic view, —namely, that we are not to let things drift along any further, but are to take the matter into our own hands and try to build up a society in which every man shall have the fullest and freest opportunity to develop his gifts and realize the truly human destiny.

And now to turn to the second point, the personal factor. Very many tributes have been paid to Toynbee's personal influence, and notably by the Master of Baliol College where he worked. No higher tribute could be given to a man than the words which have been said in the preface which the Master of Baliol, Dr. Benjamin Jowett, has written. From all that can be gathered (I had not a personal acquaintance with Toynbee) the great secret of his personal force was first of all his absolute, downright sincerity,—a sincerity which led him to believe that there was no way out of the social problem without a broad knowledge and profound study of the factors of social development. He believed, in fact, that it was a religious duty of the first importance to devote one's self to this careful study of the economic problem. It had become the most important problem of the age, and every one, he believed, was required in so far as he was a citizen to make himself acquainted with the facts of the case. And this sincerity of his saved him from some of the excesses to which an idealist of his temperament might be liable. It gave him sanity. It gave him a sense of reality. He never was away wandering in the clouds merely, but

always kept his feet on the ground, and always had some sort of opinion of his own as to what was practically necessary.

The second factor was his simplicity. Simplicity, many of us are inclined to think, is something which is to be very specially prized under the circumstances of modern life. Modern life makes against simplicity, and for complexity, threatening to weigh us down with the mere machinery of life. But Toynbee always held himself erect above these things; he always steered clear of them; and it was this transparent simplicity of his that was another secret of his great success with the workingmen of England. He used to say, when he was addressing the workingmen, that he liked to think that he was very little richer than they were; that he was linked to them in a social way by closer ties than if he had been a richer man: and consequently the acquisition of riches for the mere purpose of vanity was entirely alien to his nature, and he made his way in the world by the sheer force of his concentration upon the great and vital problems of human life.

Then, this example of Arnold Toynbee has, I think, very many lessons for us in other directions, especially because of his attachment, his constant attachment, to an ideal. Toynbee was the faithful servant of a large, broad, human ideal, pursued not with the whimsicality or effervescence of some idealists one might name, but with the sure grasp of a man who had and was accumulating solid knowledge upon the question. And what this ideal rested upon was no mere sentiment. His ideal rested deep in his religious convictions; for he held that a high ideal purpose pervades the universe and runs through history. He held that in so far as each one of us submits himself to this ideal purpose of the world, he is really working in accordance with the great laws of human destiny, and will in time approach that ideal without which we shall never be able to secure human happiness and human welfare.

One might cite other instances of Toynbee's influence; but one ought also to say that that influence was largely derived from a man who is exerting more and more sway in the world of thought, namely, his great teacher in Oxford, Professor Thomas Hill Green. And the influence of Thomas Hill Green is perceptible, I think, first of all in Toynbee's attachment to the individual—his belief in the necessity of the preservation of the individual—on the one hand; and, on the other hand, his strong social sense,—his idea that we are all brethren and members one of another. And that idea of the greatness of the individual has perhaps been no better or more forcibly stated than Green's great master, Kant, has stated it,—that one should treat every individual as an end, and never as a means to one's personal profit or pleasure. That is an idea which influenced Toynbee in common with many other men who are working in social reform, who in the light of that truth have begun to make

inquiries as to its practical application in our social usages: whether, for instance, we are treating those in our homes who act as servants and those who work in our factories, as ends in themselves, and not rather as means to our own pleasure; aids to enable us to reap greater dividends or greater profits, instead of recognizing them as men who have a common purpose with ourselves. In the light of this principle we have begun to hold up many of our social practices, and find that they will not stand the test applied. We find that we have to reform our life not only politically, but individually; that we have reform work to do in our homes and factories, as well as in the slums. Furthermore, it is in the union of the great truth of social solidarity, the great interest which binds men together, as Toynbee held, with this great truth of personal freedom,—it is in the union of these two that most men find the solution of the social problems which confront them. The aim is the preservation of the individual development and life, with due regard for the whole, of which the individual is a part: that unity between these two of which so much has been admirably said in the essay this morning.

With these few remarks, I think I may bring my observations to a close, again expressing my sense of the privilege of being allowed to speak on this platform. [*Applause.*]

[Following the address of Mr. Chubb, a selection was rendered upon the organ while a contribution was made to the funds of the Association. The President then introduced Mrs. Laura Ormiston Chant of London.]

ADDRESS OF MRS. LAURA ORMISTON CHANT.

METHODS OF PERSONAL ALLEVIATION.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The best thing that the last speaker at any meeting can do is most religiously to take care not to say what has been said before. So I think that the best thing I can do is to keep wide of the mark of that splendid paper we have heard; forget that there was such a person as Arnold Toynbee in this world, and go straight ahead with some simple thoughts of my own, that have come to me as I sat here this morning. I have been reckoning up the various denominations this morning, and I have come to the conclusion that, if I were the most ardent Plymouth brother, I could still be here on this platform of the Free Religious Association. I think that is such a comfort in my own life. I have tried hard to keep free of denominationalism as I am growing older and have more to do and more to believe, to hope, to influence; not that I am getting less

religious, but a great deal more so; and I think that the real unreligiousness of the world is when it is afraid to discuss religious questions religiously. [*Applause.*]

One of the objects of this Association is to encourage scientific knowledge of religion and ethics. A great many of us are feeling earnestly to-day that a great deal of unreligion comes from the want of a scientific knowledge of what religion should be and what it aims to be. That "religion is man's endeavor to perfect himself" is true; but that religion is also a great power that is helping man outside of himself to his own perfection, is also true; and to-day the thought is encouraging that we can have an Association that asks for no particular badge, for no catalogue of opinions, for no confession of faith, but only for sincerity of heart, for the courtesies of civilized men and women, for the passionate desire to care for those who are in need, for the desire to conceive what that growth means which is ushering in a brighter day, a stronger religiousness, a greater warmth in all our church life and outside of our churches. This is a grand thing, and is greatly needed. We have such a movement in England, but not in name at present. It is a very wonderful thing how, unconsciously to themselves, those churches that are supposed to be most opposed to religious discussion are the very ones that are manifesting in their conduct a great desire for the advance of freedom, for absolute sincerity, for the utmost liberty of thought and conscience. It is a sign of growth. It will bring its pains and difficulties, but, I take it, if I am growing properly, I shall not ask to grow by stopping somebody's else growth. If I am a tree in a well appointed grove-land, I shall not grow by stunting the next tree, but shall only ask to grow in order to help that tree to grow too.

Another thing I want to say earnestly to you is this: Do not be too anxious to ask what is the result of what you are doing to-day. Do it; do it. If it is right, results will take care of themselves; and when people ask me, What is the future of Christianity? what is the future of religion? what is the future of this or that doctrine? I have my own ideas about it, and I have my own ideal of it which I am aspiring after; but I would never trouble my head about the future of doctrines or Christianity or religion. These things are of God, and they will only die when God dies; and all you have to do is to be true to the truth that comes to you. Yet do not rest with that truth, but say, "I have received one, therefore I am capable of receiving two truths. I have received two, and now I am able to receive three," and so on. Only I ask that, because we cannot understand what the future is bringing to human nature, we shall not take a hopeless view of the future.

Look, for instance, at that dragon-fly,—at this time of the year so interesting a denizen of the wayside pond. Go and look at him in his grub-state, when he is as ugly as he can be. He has an ugly pair of jaws, and lives down under the water; never comes to the top of the water if he can help it. He is content with the muddy water at the bottom of the pool. He loves his savage life apparently, devouring and being devoured. But, supposing he is devouring and not devoured, there comes a day when he ceases to pursue, and ceases to be hungry; when he is possessed of a new desire; when his instinct leads him to find a blade of grass, or a twig or water-plant to which he can cling. Some instinct is stirring in his poor dull organism that tells him he has got to cling to something, and he finds it and clings for dear life. He is also (though he does not know it) changing color; but you and I know it, and see that he is coming from darkness into light, as far as skin goes. He is becoming a little paler. And by-and-by, out of that impulse to cling to something, comes the impulse to climb; and the grub climbs accordingly, and you can watch him leaving forever behind him the bottom of the pool and climbing up that spear of grass or lily-stem, and getting nearer the surface of the water, until there comes over him an agony I can only liken to the pains of physical death. He lies there motionless, as if some great transition were awaiting him; and so there is. By-and-by a convulsion seizes the creature; he splits from head to foot, and out of that lifeless shell which lies there on the water there comes an embryo glorious dragon-fly, a perfect creature though so imperfect in the use of its perfection. Wings it has but it can fly not; a body it has, but it can use it not; and there it waits, upon the broad-expanded leaf or twig, a wonderful structure if appearance goes for anything. But above it is that sun that has warmed many a myriad of its kind, and which will warm it and bring it to its life. And that sun, with which the dragon-fly seemingly has nothing to do, and of which it knows nothing except through sense,—that sun unfolds its wings for it, develops the hairs upon its body; and by-and-by, on the top of all those other instincts,—the instinct to cling, the instinct to climb, the instinct just to lie in the sunshine,—there comes the new-born instinct to fly into the atmosphere, so different a creature from what he was before! Should the dragon-fly grub be brought up into the air, he would die; and now if he were taken back again he would die. Surely, he has not changed his nature, but only a higher nature has come to him and over him, and henceforth he dwells among trees and flowers and birds, and as we see what a happy and free life is his, were anybody to suggest that he should go back again to the darkness of

the pool, to the dullness and degradation of the mud, we should be filled with amazement.

What is the purpose of my parable? It is to show us that the grub-stages are all right, that those grub-stages are our only means of attaining to other and higher stages. When we are grubs we are not to check the great impulse to cling and to climb upward, but whatever comes to us is to be encouraged and developed, and we are to be allowed free thoughts, that we may be perfect human beings. That is the object of this Association. It is to help men and women out of their grub-stage, and give them the kindly sympathy and help and encouragement which they need as our brothers and which marks us off once and forever from the savage state from which you and I may have come. I am positively certain that when I was a half-clothed savage, wandering it may be through the woods and barren mountains, all those thousands of years ago, I did not love my brother-man and sister-woman. I am also certain my whole attitude was that of supreme hatred of anybody like myself; and the line of demarcation between the grub-fly stage of man and civilized human beings is this passion to love one another. It has been dimly echoed from the earliest religions, and the more religion is developed the more does the gospel of love take its central place as being itself the supreme religiousness of religion. For, bringing higher education, bringing more light and strength and better physical development to those who are weak and feeble, bringing sight to the fingers of the blind, bringing the sense of hearing to the deaf,—all these things are the natural passion and impulse of real genuine religiousness and love.

Those other things that we have called religion,—dogmas, forms, discussions about things,—why, they are like the little momentary rains that come on an April day when the clouds obscure the sun for a moment, but they can no more stop the sun from shining than we can interfere in any way with the eternal fact that Love is the religion of man, and that as man becomes more religious, he will love more; for Love is the fulfilling of the whole law, natural and spiritual. That is the ideal that has come to us,—to some of us dimly, to some of us like a heavenly vision to which we cannot for the life of us be disobedient. When you come in your daily life to feel an impulse to help or pity the man who needs it, that is the highest development of religion in you asserting itself; and if you let any truism in political economy, or any platitude of so-called social economy, stop you from your deed of pity or love you have done harm to the real religiousness in you. Rank heretic am I to the political economist dogmas. I regard those theories as the mere scaffolding to the heavenly edifice behind them.

Again, I may do my good deed very foolishly. I may from pity for the poor woman on the door-step go and drop half a dollar in her lap. I may pauperize her. I may teach her the miserable lesson that there are people who will keep her in idleness; the lesson that people need not work. But if that half-dollar be the extent of my ideal of charity, better that I give it than be stopped by some theory. The evil I did the woman in the charity will die with her, but the evil I should do to myself in not giving will not die with me; it will go on multiplying itself. When there comes to me the appeal of somebody who needs help, if I withhold my first heart-impulse to help, however unwise, I should probably not have a second impulse that could be appealed to. I am not asking that we should play the fool exceedingly, in our charity; but I would say, gratify any generous impulse you have; it is the religious side of your nature,—any pity, any compassion, any mercy, gratify it; only take care that you gain knowledge, that you ask of those who can teach you, that you take in ideas; in fact, take care that you are growing.

Now, I must speak respectfully of the political economists, for the length of their books and the excellence with which they write; but their theories are not always practical. Let us have theories that grow out of practice; let us put our practice and theories together, and derive a new theory from that. There is no use in my starting in the morning with a skeleton idea of what I am to do during the day—my plans are continually broken in upon. But remember this, that behind one's skeleton idea as he conceives and intends it, there is to be a principle, and that principle, with which one should get out of bed in the morning, is this,—Whoever asks my help, if I can help him I am bound to help him or die; whoever asks me for advice I am bound to give him advice or be untrue to the advice which has made me what I am. That is the theory. So I form my plan: I will have my breakfast by half-past eight, then go and write a paper; in the afternoon I will address a drawing-room company, and in the evening attend a meeting. But there comes in something which prevents rigidity. The unelastic people who do not make any changes in their plans, are the people who make a great many mistakes, and are obstructionists. In the morning somebody comes in who did not come into my plan. I may send word, "Mrs. Chant is engaged"; but am I to sit at the table and refuse a call of pity? A poor sad voice has come to my ear, and if I deaden my ear to the sound of that voice and shut up my heart to that appeal for pity, why, the next time I have an opportunity to do, and would be willing to help, I shall have no ear to hear or heart to pity. I must do my best.

Only a week before I came from England, a young fellow who had just come out of prison called on me. He was very miserable, and badly clothed, and sick, but a situation as light porter in a store had opened for him, and if he could only get some clothes, why, poor fellow, he had a chance of getting the situation and of being an honest man. What a pity it is that you cannot get all human beings that want clothes to fit the patterns you happen to have! [*Laughter.*] I took him into a cab, and drove around to find a garment that would in some sort fit him. The most generous man of the number whom I saw was a lofty man, six feet high, and so broad that I could get three of this fellow into his coat. That same afternoon I took him to a boarding-place. "Well," you may say, "what was the use of it? was not your writing of more importance than that young man?" Ah, will you remember that all our speeches and sermons are in vain if they lack that one thing which sends them home to hearts, and that is the presence of heart in them? If I had suppressed the pity in me by turning away from that man, I should not have a heart big enough to do the work that the hundreds who are sent to me for help need to have done. So you see, forever and forever, we go in a circle infinitely large and infinitely little. Infinitely large, since there is no limit to the work we have set our hands to do and that is still before the world to be done; and infinitely small, because nothing should be too little and unpleasant to be done, nor anyone too insignificant to do it for. What you and I have to think of is, that this same principle, with which we are going to work for the thousand and inspire them, is the same that we must have when we work for one heart and seek to kindle it into love.

I have an incident. I am rash sometimes, according to Mrs. Grundy's idea, but nothing bad has come of it. I myself have a method in my madness, some common sense in my rashness, for there come to me men and women who have to be clutched by strong and kind hands; but we have a large number of people who lack tact, who mean to be exceedingly good and kind, yet who do their kindness in just the way to make it cruelty. What we need is true tact. And this comes not from "finesse," but from the kindness and simplicity arising in the feeling that what I would not have done to myself, that my fellow-man must not have done to him. I took home to my house two criminals. One had been in the women's prison five years; the other had been in jail one year. They were husband and wife. I dare say Mr. Chubb will remember the crime for which those two people were convicted,—it was the "Hart Case," in Chelsea. The wife had been given five years for an offence for which the husband got one;—she had done

one thing which brought her within the pale of a larger sentence. When she came out of prison, twenty-four years of age, she stood up in her great beauty with hatred in her heart for society, and looked upon good women as so many hostile foes who would triumph over her. When she came out of jail she stood alone. Thanks to a friend who knew her I was able to write her a kind little note asking her to come and have some tea with me as quickly as she could, and I sent the necessary money to her. She marched into the drawing-room handsome and stately, in an ulster which her husband had bought for her with his last money that she might hide her prison-garb, and seated herself in a chair. The whole attitude of the woman, and expression of her face, said, "I am as good as you, and if you dare to think I am not I shall go." I had to conquer that spirit; and such a thing, you know, is like going up a glacier and expecting to take sunshine enough to melt it. However, I know what prison-life is, and as that pale creature sat before me her wretchedness was the "open sesame" of my heart. I got tea ready, and the bread and butter came as if cut for a distinguished guest. When she sat with a cup of tea in her hand I said to the poor girl, "How often you must have wanted a cup of tea when you were in prison." And the sympathetic word broke her down; she set the cup of tea on the floor and cried as if her heart would break. Then she got up, angry, and said, "I thought I never would shed another tear, and now you are making me cry again." I cried with her.

"Oh, but," says someone, "she had been a criminal!" So have you and I. Whenever we have cried over the wrong things we have done, it is because we have been criminals, although we have not been to prison. But I talked with her about what she might be in the future, and planned how she should help back her weak husband, and her face grew quite gay. Then I remembered this bad husband, who had been so profligate some of you would not have touched him; but if you are doing a thing you think right, you must not let anything hinder you from doing it; difficulties have got to be got around somehow—so I sent him the rest of the cake (and we had not much for him left), and the next morning the two stood before me. They had come to breakfast. Yes, I took them into my house. One asks, "Weren't you afraid of burglary?" You must not be afraid. Do you know, the worst things we experience in life are the things we fear, but that do not actually happen. Do not be foolish, and do not give temptation any place. We had no burglary, but I robbed them of their misery and want of self-respect, and gave them instead a new knowledge of the real religiouness of things; and of their own free will they came to a total-

abstinence meeting in the evening, and took the total-abstinence pledge as the only tribute they could give me.

And now I will tell you something else. I had the extremely discouraging business of going down to Scotland-Yard, the centre of our criminal department, to get off from the woman the eighteen months' supervision that still hung over her head. My knees trembled under me; and, do you know, I felt as if I were begging for myself, and had been convicted myself. I told the Keeper of the institution my story, and I thought, what a weak, namby-pamby story it was, that myself and husband had been two such idiots as to take these people into our house for a month, and had tried to give them a new start in life. I felt that he would feel as if I were a little bit insane; but again the thing I greatly feared did not come; instead, there was a glimpse of Paradise in that ugly, dingy office. He put his finger to his eye and wiped a tear away, and said, "I have been twenty-five years in this department, and that is what I want to have done. Now, can't you do for two thousand what you have done for these two? and we will help you." [*Applause.*] So I want you to understand that all your officials in high places may not be so inaccessible as you may think, and may be more easily reached through personal intercession than in any other way. At any rate, we got the money needed for these people, and I got them over the sea, and for a few months they did remarkably well; so well that their employer took it upon himself to write me to tell me how well they did. But now comes the sorrow; you must always expect it. The husband has just taken to drinking. The wife writes me a forlorn, heart-broken letter to say, "He has ruined me, and left me, and I am alone. It seems a shame to call upon you who have done so much for us, and I am ashamed to tell you how unworthy he is of what you have done. But I am left alone: what am I to do? If I could only get into the States I could get employment." So I wrote, "I am determined to help you to the uttermost," and I sent her money enough to get into the States. I said, "Never mind your husband. He yet has discipline to go through. He has yet to go amongst the swine and harlots, it may be, like the prodigal son, before he comes like the prodigal son to understand what his father's house means. I will look out for him,"—and I have got some friends on the track of that gentleman. He does not know it, but when he lands in London the first thing that will meet him when he gets there will be a friendly hand on his shoulder: "How did you come here? Mrs. Chant has asked me to take you in hand." He won't like it, but that is the way we are obliged to do our work.

Now, remember that we must feel and understand that a

religion that is not love, that has not a foundation of unlimited love, love that cannot be bounded or defeated, is not religion; it may be a creed, but it is not religion. Let us take heart to-day that movements like this are not retrogression but growth; they do not mean the human race falling into terrible license when it breaks away from dogmatism, as was written the other day. Every such movement is rather the dawning of the morning light shining upon us. It is humanity beginning to understand that religion is not a matter of words, nor confessions of faith, nor creeds. All those things can be under the sheltering arms of religion; but religion itself is the unlimited love-principle in man that makes him gentle where he would be rough, that makes him kind where he would be brutal, that makes him hopeful where he would despair and die, that makes him skilled where he would be ignorant, that makes him climb upward where otherwise he would lie down by the roadside, and gives him sight that is only limited by the physical environment of man; — and when, through this physical environment, we have learned lessons of unlimited spiritual environment, the physical environment will pass away, and what the next environment will be, God knows, and you and I do not know yet. [*Applause.*]

THE PRESIDENT: — These speakers from Old England seem very much at home in New England, and especially on the platform of the Free Religious Association; but I hope as many of you as possible will remain to hear the speeches which are to come from those who are locally of our own country, though to-day all countries are one in the fellowship of this place. I want you now to hear from Chicago. Chicago, you know, is to have the World's Fair, and Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones is here, and is to give us a word on this topic of world-wide sympathy. I learned on my recent visit to Chicago that Mr. Jones' church there, which is called "All Souls' Church," well justifies its name. The doors of that edifice are open every day of the week, to every man, woman and child who may enter them for any comfort or help they may gain there. Mr. Jones will now address us. [*Applause.*]

ADDRESS OF REV. JENKIN LLOYD JONES.

SOCIAL PROGRESS THROUGH ORGANIZED EFFORT.

MY first impulse is to express my sympathy with this long-suffering audience, but I suppress that impulse to save time to say that I am profoundly grateful for the privilege of standing even for a moment before a full audience, to express my appreciation of the impressive paper that we have listened to, and furthermore to express my delight that this Free Religious Association — which has always

been an ideal to me which, let me frankly confess, the actual has somewhat faintly realized — seems to be summoned once more, this morning, towards a destiny for which I believe it is fitted, and which I yet have great faith that it will some day reach.

I come here, I am fully aware, not entirely in my private capacity. I have a sort of feeling that I am here because there has been a meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference over there in the Mississippi valley, whose pulses beat in rhythm with the best purposes of this Association. The Western Unitarian Conference, as I have often had occasion to say, is the Free Religious Association trying to get to work. The Free Religious Association is the Western Conference reduced to what some of our friends are anxious we should be,— a talking body, divested of executive functions.

But the time is too late for congratulations or empty words. A few years ago the word in education was, teach the child things, and not names; teach him to become acquainted with facts, with Nature. Scientific culture was the word. A few years later the word was, Give the child possession of himself; teach him the control of his fingers; teach him to see; teach him to handle things; give him manual training, so that he may be able to stand in this practical world and fight a practical battle. To-day the word, given by a thousand voices, coming to us from many directions, is Moral education. Prepare your child in the public school, not for college but for life, and he will be all the better fitted for life. Give him a little of mathemathics and geography and grammar, but see to it that you give him love and sympathy, and contact with the problem of life. Make him know that he is a living soul, with powers which must be used for the ennobling of mankind and not for himself. That is the word now; and it is being heard in our Teachers' Conventions and in our Educational Associations; and it is beginning to be heard also — the place where it ought first to have been heard — in our Religious Associations. It has come to pass that finally, nineteen hundred years after Jesus lived, it is possible to summon a denominational convention in which the delegates are more interested in the practical question of humanitarian development than they are in the theological manipulation of texts. The time has come when even a Unitarian convention can come together, where learned essays as to how to handle Greek roots are retired in order to give room for more learned essays that undertake to develop the principles of good-will and practical helpfulness and utility in the world.

And then, again, I am glad that on this day and at this hour there is a recognition of the fact that more than all

institutions, and more than all organizations, is the importance of the individual. No, let us not say that, for all organizations and institutions, valuable as they may be, are valuable only when they are exponents of living men and living women; they are valuable only when they are manifestations of the vitality of individuals, executive centres placed in the human heart and human head, coming together in the focus of co-operation. These flags carry me back, as they do many of you, to the old heroic days, and I am reminded of the unlettered insight of the soldier who said, "When Gen. McPherson rides through the camp, he leaves a streak of Sunday behind him always"; and that was not because he was a great commander of men, which he was, not because he was a Major General in command of the Army of the Tennessee, but because he was an enkindled soul, because he was a magnetic individual with a heart, and that heart beamed through his eye; because he touched his men by the vitality of a magnificent personality. And that is the only way the world is moved along. I believe that when science is ultimately understood, instead of underestimating, it will emphasize and increase the estimate of the individual. Nine hundred and ninety-nine individuals that are produced in any species are apparently an exact counterpart one of the other. The pattern has not been deviated from. But the thousandth insect, or bird, or whatever it may be, by some happy combination of circumstances or some special impulse from within, has been enabled to project a slight deviation,—a little gayer plumage, a little stronger claw, a little clearer eye, it may be; and that one-thousandth specimen that has been enabled to differentiate a little from the other nine hundred and nine-nine is the point of departure which will mark the upward trend of Nature; which will show where the forces of God take another lease on life, and start upward. The same thing is true exactly in your life and in mine. The same thing is true exactly in morals and in religion. Where there is a soul that dares defy the established, where there is a soul that dares venture upon the unexplored, that dares risk the accepted in the interest of an ideal, there is the prophet of the future; there is the point upon which humanity takes a new hold, and upon which and from which there will be a departure that will be to the betterment and the ennoblement of the world. [*Applause.*]

If I were to sum up what little experience I have had in these twenty years of work among men and in churches — for I believe in churches — I would say, I think, that it is a constant surprise at the unutilized forces there are lying around in every community,—the amount of uninvested capital there is to be found in the smallest little company of men and women. Take the most prosaic and stolid

company of Sunday-school children, reduce them to thirty, or twenty, or ten, and I say there is then more possibility in those ten children than you or I are ever likely to draw forth. If we are ever to accomplish anything in church work or missionary work, it is by daring to believe there are possibilities in people lying around us that have not yet been discovered or invested. And so I believe that this Free Religious Association does right in putting the emphasis on the individual; for however beautiful and noble, and however reasonable these great dreams of the socialistic reformers of our day may be (and I believe them to be great), they can be reached only upon the heights of individualism. We have got to make better men and women before we can make our religious societies better; the individual must be more thought of if we are to secure a better adjustment of things and better relations between the members of society.

I believe, friends, that the Free Religious Association is yet to become an inspiration, and realize its object. There are forces in every community that are waiting to be persuaded with this dream of a religion that is based upon a purpose and not upon a dogma; that will undertake to organize men and women for human helpfulness and not for denominational divisions. When it is possible to persuade them that we mean what we say, and are willing to undertake to practise it, we will be surprised to find how in every community, from the Pacific to the Atlantic, there are those who are ready to follow in line and touch elbows, and invest their lives and hearts and minds in this work. [*Applause.*]

We have, as we think, great cause of congratulation over the progress already made; but we have not yet begun to do the work in this country which the free religious ideal has yet to do. The problem to-day is not, who is to be the next president? It is not even the question of Nationalism or the problems which Henry George and others are at work upon. It is the question, how to sanctify and ennoble and beautify the home; how to make our homes something more than a steam-railway station where the young men and women wait for the next train that will take them into social dissipation. The question is, how to make a larger and richer home, where the individual shall find larger opportunities, diviner companionships, and a more direct road to the personal investment of his energy for the betterment of the world as we now find it.

Now I know there are those who say, This is all very well, but it is not religion. Out West they say, It is not Unitarianism. They say, "There are very nice people over there, but they are not religious." This reminds me of an incident which occurred in the Sequatchie valley

just as the troops of Gen. Sherman hurried along to the relief of Gen. Thomas, who was beleagured in Chattanooga. We came upon the comfortable quarters of the Twelfth Army Corps from the Army of the Potomac. They had got there before we had, and were in comfortable quarters, laid out in mathematical proportions, with dress-parade ground in the front line. As the ragged troops marched by, an artillery sergeant belonging to this Twelfth Corps, resplendent with his new red cheverons and the bright stripe down his trouser-legs, said to a mounted orderly who happened to have his boots blacked and whom he thus mistook for one of the well-dressed members of his own corps, "Those are an interesting lot of fellows, aren't they? But they are no soldiers. Why, there is nothing military about them." That touched the orderly, and he said, "All right, sergeant, you attend to soldiering down here, and I will go on with these follows who are going around this mountain to see if they can't shove Bragg off Missionary Ridge and get some victuals to pap Thomas's men." And he put spurs to his horse, and left the military sergeant. I think that this, in the problem now before us, is about the work we are called upon to do. If it is not religious work, all the more we are called upon to do it, and if done it will take a religious inspiration and bring a radiance in the face of men and women that is more noble than the radiance that may come from any ordinary activities.

Just a day or two before I started from home, the mail brought me two wonderful photographs taken at the Lick University by the astronomer in charge, Mr. Burnham, during a snow-storm which visited that vicinity last Winter. They are marvelous pictures, a wonderful piece of art. The observatory contains the most magnificent telescopic adjustments in the world, and everything about it is calculated to cause the intelligent mind to enkindle with enthusiasm. But, friends, here is the other truth. We are proud of the Lick observatory, but more far-reaching and significant than the telescope in the Lick observatory is the eye that is back of that telescope, the mind that directs that telescope; and that mind, as I have occasion to know, is the mind of an humble, modest man who, through long years of drudgery in the musty court-rooms of Chicago, had taken down stenographically the evidence of witnesses, and while he was doing that work year after year, earning humble bread, he was working in such a way that his nearest neighbors (for he lived on the South-side where I live) never suspected that there was going in and out amongst them day by day a man who was even then, through his garden-telescope, finding his way to the double stars in the heavens so as to astonish, surprise and command the admiration of the scientific world. We did not realize that, then and there,

there was a man better known in scientific circles in London than among the men and women who were living as next-door neighbors to him. And now he has been found. And I say the Free Religious Association to-day is beginning to emphasize this fact, that greater than Lick observatory, nobler than the magnificent telescope, is the man Burnham; and that noble as was the man who dedicated his wealth to the institution, still more noble was the energy and persistency and courage of that student who, in the midst of his daily cares, found time, opportunity and courage to commune with the stars and make himself acquainted with the secrets thereof.

I tell you, friends, that when you once get to the religious consideration of these ideas that we now profess to love, there will come an improvement in our life; a home and a church that will indeed help to realize these humanitarian, socialistic dreams. As it is now, all this is but another investment of talk. All this is the Western Conference without executive functions. I am hungry for the inspiration that will strike some of you, brothers and sisters, and will flash across the distance and will light upon our lives out there in the Mississippi valley, establishing actual co-operation and practical helpfulness between us, so that the land will at last begin to bloom with the blossoms of that free religion, the seeds of which, Mr. President, this Association has been carefully, wisely and diligently sowing for the last twenty years and more. I do not know how the connection is to be made, or when, but somehow, if you persist, we will touch elbows in this matter. The work for which this Association is organized is the work we are trying to do out West under the name of the Western Unitarian Conference. As we flounder there, and as you soar here, perhaps sometime or other we may catch your wings and put them on our bodies, and you will soar less and we will flounder less; so with our feet on the ground and our head in the air, we will make one body with one spirit. [*Applause.*]

THE PRESIDENT: — To apply Ralph Waldo Emerson's phrase, Mr. Jones wants to "hitch his wagon to our star," and how to do it is the problem. His military illustrations have called to mind a letter which I received only a week or two since from Shenandoah valley, from a correspondent there, a very intelligent man, a lawyer, who has lived there many years, and who writes this letter of fifteen or sixteen pages as a Macedonian cry to the Free Religious Association to come down there to help them in the Shenandoah valley. He speaks of individuals and families all through that valley that are now emancipated from all churches, from all creeds, and are wandering about in an abyss of ignorant helplessness, not

knowing what or whom to follow. The tone and spirit of the letter were such that if I had been thirty years old I think I should have packed my carpet-bag at once and started for the Shenandoah; and if there is any young man here who has been entranced by Mr. Jones' voice and inspiration to do that sort of personal work, in a place where he will have to encounter hardships and live on the soil, I can put into his hands this letter which will tell him where he can go to do it.

Now we come back to Massachusetts. There is one voice which we are always glad to hear on this platform, the voice of one who has been familiar with these social and moral problems through all his work since he entered on the sphere of a public lecturer or preacher, Frederick A. Hinckley, once of Providence, now of the Free Congregational Society in Florence, Mass. Will Mr. Hinckley let us hear from him? [*Applause.*]

ADDRESS OF FREDERIC A. HINCKLEY.

THE NECESSITY FOR THE INCREASE OF OPPORTUNITY.

It is late, friends, but the order of the programme must be carried out; so I am here. Now, what is all this coming to? What is the impulse in our lives which is to be strengthened by this morning's meeting? We have heard a very profound paper concerning fundamental principles; we have heard very much that is interesting concerning methods of alleviation, and concerning the organizing of the impulse to relieve our fellow-men wherever they need relief. I have somehow an indefinable sense that a word needs to be added which has not yet been spoken,—at least not in very emphatic form,—in behalf of those great reformatory movements of the past and present time whose aim is not simply to deal in the abstract with fundamental principles (great as is that aim), nor to be content to go down with the open hand of sympathy into districts needing practical help, but whose aim, first, last, and all the time, is to establish conditions of universal justice. I believe that what the world needs most to-day is not the development of the individual in order that social reform shall be successful, but the success of social reform in order that the individual shall have an opportunity to develop himself. [*Applause.*]

We hear a great deal in these days about individualism, and about the danger to individualism which is coming out of these movements called Socialism and Nationalism and other names which might be mentioned. There are two kinds of individualism, friends. There is an individualism which is personified selfishness, an individualism which looks out simply for self at the expense of everybody else. Nobody, so far as I know, is an advocate, certainly no one would assume the public advocacy of that kind of individ-

ualism. But there is another kind of individualism,— perhaps I might better say an individuality,— which means the right development of the individual in the largest, freest and strongest possible manner. I hold that the great end and aim of human society, the great aim of individual effort, the great aim of the church at its best, the great aim of every organization of reform is to promote this broad, comprehensive, strong type of individuality. The reforms have come into existence in all the past years, as they are in existence to-day, as it seems to me, simply to open the way for the development of strong individual men and women. It is true, what Pope said so long ago, "The proper study of mankind is man"; and it is true, as Wendell Phillips used to say, that all our institutions are but the scaffolding wherewith to build a man.

What we need, therefore, I would suggest, is not simply to apply methods of relief; is not simply to get a correct philosophy of moral education. We need to take the *first step* toward a broad and comprehensive moral education, and toward the opportunity for the largest personal effort. And that is just what the reforms have been trying to do in all the ages, and what they are trying to do to-day. The Anti-slavery reform found men in this country wearing chains because they were black: and what was the first step for the development of individuality in the chattel-slavery of the south? It was striking off the fetters, and placing in the hands of the slave the ballot. The Anti-slavery movement stood for that reform. It was the John the Baptist in America, demanding for the chattel-slave in the South that moral education should be possible to him, and that he should have the largest possibility for personal effort for perfecting himself, and, through perfecting himself, for the perfecting of American society. Again, fifty years ago the condition of woman was such that she was subordinated in all the fields of practical effort to man. Industry was closed to her, the largest opportunities of education were closed to her, she could not be a physician, she could not go to college, she could not stand behind a counter, she could not have a business of her own. Was that a good environment for the development of individuality in woman? Not at all. The first step toward the development of individuality for woman was what? Why, the organization of the growing sentiment in the individual mind and conscience into a great reformatory movement which, for the last forty or fifty years, and still to-day, is demanding that before the law, and before all our customs, in industry, in education, in politics, everywhere, there shall be no distinction, but men and women shall stand side by side on an equal platform, with equal opportunities for the development of the faculties which are theirs. [*Applause.*]

Go down with me into the Pennsylvania coal-mines: what is the opportunity there for the development of individuality? Go with me into the New-England cotton-mills: what is the opportunity there for the development of individuality? The soul, mind, heart and conscience of mankind, feeling their way along, have at last come to join hands together and to take organized action in a great movement which, under various names, has been demanding for years, and is demanding more and more with the lapse of years, that the opportunities of life shall be open not only to the favored few but to all. Mr. Abbot told us of his dream of a universal brotherhood in which all should be seeking the welfare of each. It is the great dream of the ages. He has shared it with every other noble soul: and all that is noble in humanity is dreaming the same dream to-day. But, friends, the great movements under the banner of Socialism, under the banner of Nationalism, — I am not here to say that they are complete movements: no movement is complete: I never expect to live to see a reform which shall cover the sphere, — but every one of these reforms is helping on that good time. In spite of all the imperfections of individual reformers, — and they have imperfections because they are men like the rest of us, — the great end and aim of every one of these reforms is to enlarge the opportunity for the individual. To abolish the conditions which exist in those coal-mines; to bring about an evolution to a higher order of things in which the conditions that exist in these New-England cotton-mills shall become impossible; to establish conditions of justice, to drive out the competitive spirit before the incoming of the religious spirit of co-operation — that is what these reforms are trying to do.

I do not want to be understood as criticising anything that has been said, but, standing here to say the closing word for the morning, I want to show this other side. I trust it will not be considered an assumption on my part for me to desire to add this word to the good words that have already been said here, — that the reforms are not antagonistic to the growth of the individual; that there is no antagonism between the idea of moral education and personal effort, and the idea of organized social reformatory work: but that the reforms, every one of them, are working in just the line on which all of us who have taken part in this discussion desire to see work done. The old Anti-slavery movement, the Woman-suffrage movement of to-day, the movement which aims to do justice to labor, the movement which aims to establish justice for the man who gets inside of prison, the movement which aims to bring proper conditions of birth to every child of humanity, the movement which would surround every little child and

every older child and all humanity with the conditions of "sweetness and light,"— all these reforms, under whatever name, are movements working in the line of developing higher individuality. So let us not antagonize the two things. Let us look, as we do look in all other matters, for the agreements between the two; and when we go out from this meeting let it be with the feeling that work for moral education, work in the line of personal effort, work for the largest rights of woman, and for just opportunities for labor,— work in every direction, organized and unorganized, for the benefit of humanity, is forever one and the same: that there is a unity running through all good work, and that we who have been here to-day should, because of this meeting, go out to resume our various parts in life with stimulus to new efforts, go out in that spirit of unity which recognizes the solidarity of the race, the brotherhood of all mankind. So shall we come to realize that, as Theodore Parker said, justice, above all things else, is the key-note of the world, and that all else is ever out of tune. Let us strike our note in harmony with others who are laboring to keep up and enlarge this great anthem of justice, to the end that in due course of time, so far as it is in our power to bring about so glorious a consummation, the whole world shall be in tune. [*Applause.*]

THE PRESIDENT:— With these wise remarks of Mr. Hinckley, which well balance the two sides of the great social problem, we will, with your favor, now adjourn to the afternoon session.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT POTTER.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

As we begin the afternoon session I must ask you to indulge me in a few introductory remarks in reference to the subject chosen for the discussion. "The sympathy of Religions" has been one of the favorite topics of the Free Religious Association: and one of our favorite methods has been to bring together on our platform representatives of the different religions and nations of the world. Fellowship of spirit, which is one of the stated objects of the Association in its Constitution, has always among us been interpreted to cover all the religions of the world. It has seemed, to some of us at least, that if we could get hold of the genuine and permanent basic truths of the various religions of mankind, we should find ourselves on common ground; and that those basic and permanent truths, when

intelligently and legitimately developed, tend to evolve a common and universal religion. So much have we emphasized in the past this truth of the sympathy of religions, that we have sometimes been charged not only with forgetting the actual antagonisms that exist between religions because of their different claims, but we have been charged with the attempt to make outright a new religion, as it were mechanically, by piecing together what seem to be truths to us in all the old religions and existing religions. Nothing could be farther than this from the actual position of the Free Religious Association, or from the position of any prominent members who have ever spoken on its platform or written concerning its principles. We have based ourselves from the outset upon the fact of the orderly historical evolution of religious thought and institutions; and so far from believing that any company of individuals could ever get together to make a religion, we have said that no religion was ever thus created, but all have been gradual growths out of certain fundamental principles; and what we have meant by the sympathy of religions is that the various religions of the world hold certain ideas, sentiments and motives in common. Further, in all existing religions there is a progressive party. Every religion to-day that is alive is moving forward; and we see that these different bodies of men and women of the different religions who are advancing are on converging lines, tending toward a common point: so that out of a certain sympathy of ideas and sentiments in their organizing principles there will come in time a point of intellectual harmony and practical union and co-operation. But all is taking place through the laws of evolution and not by any mechanical creation. All is organic in the religious world, as in all other parts of the domain of the universe.

To-day we take up what we may call a corollary from this principle of the sympathy of religions. There have been various movements in late years among the Oriental nations: new life has come into the East. This has been in part from their contact with the life of the West, and in part through a new revival of old but still living forces in those nations themselves. This modern uprising of Oriental life is our topic this afternoon. And though we are to speak of national forces rather than of specially religious forces, of national movements rather than of specially religious movements, yet it is impossible that the two should not be working together; and so the various speakers will address us upon the special progressive activities here and there in the Oriental nations, and upon the reciprocal influences that are at work, to and fro, between the East and the West, bringing peoples of different thought and origin and environment on common ground, making the

world of different nations of one kith, and tending toward that practical Brotherhood of Mankind which is the dream of all our social schemes of amelioration.

Foremost among these uprising Oriental nations is Japan. A gentleman who has lived in Japan for a number of years, who is thoroughly conversant with the important progressive movements that have been going on in that empire, is specially to speak to us of the western influences upon that country. I have great satisfaction in introducing to you Rev. Dr. Griffis of Boston, of the Shawmut Congregational Church, to whom you will now give your attention. [*Applause.*]

ADDRESS OF WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS, D.D.

THE PRESENT ASPECT OF AFFAIRS IN JAPAN.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The subject of the Influence of the Western Nations upon the great continent from which have come forth all religion and all the great conservative influences of the world, is one not only of fascinating interest to all who come from the European stock of humanity, but I think it has an especial importance and interest to the American. When we come to contrast the diverse political and social thoughts of the East and the West we are struck with this fact, that when the nations that followed the setting of the sun, starting out from their homes in Central Asia, perhaps on the Great Plateau of Central Asia, and moving toward the Atlantic and across,—when they began their emigration, they seem to have started with a particular bias and genius which they have ever maintained; namely, the inquiring spirit, the look toward the future rather than toward the past, the attempt to master Nature, the search for the best means by which they could take the earth and make it bring forth the best for the political, the social, the religious life of men. But along with that intense, enterprising spirit we must also mark them in history by another peculiarity. We see that the ancient empires, the political fabrics, even the social fabrics, were changeable; and that after a few score or few hundred years of life the political systems passed away. In fact there seems to have been a differing political system with almost every fresh emigration. The conquering hordes poured over the continent of Europe so that European history, which is our heritage, is a history not only of the mastery of Nature by the mind of man, but also, we must confess, a history of unstable political and social forms: whereas, when we look over Asia, we find quite the reverse. We find that the political systems have been vastly shorter in duration even than

the European, while the social system is almost unchangeable.

Look at China. We have been taught to think that China is a country that has always been asleep, or at least has felt in the mood in which a man feels (though I see you do not) right after dinner. We think of China as a nation which has been in a state of perpetually arrested development. But we find that her political history is almost like a kaleidoscope; and the dynasty that sits on the throne of China to-day, which introduced the pig-tail of which our Chinese washer-men are so proud, was unknown in China three hundred years ago. To resist it the Chinese poured out their blood like water. That dynasty, which is a Tartar dynasty, is the thirty-fourth in the history of China: and the Chinese people, who are undoubtedly a race of comparatively Southern origin, have been conquered again and again by the hordes coming out of the North, who were as different in language and blood and general disposition and social habits as the Barbarians were different from the Romans in the Roman empire. But what has been the effect? China, with her unchangeable social condition, has simply absorbed these Barbarians as fast as they have come to China, and compelled them to take her language and her social forms. By means of the tremendous solvent of her language and literature she has taken these repeated invasions of blood into her own body, so that the race that rules her came out of a race of barbarians and savages, yet has shown itself the most improvable race in all Asia. But there is the fact of unchangeable social form amid various political forms: for China has had the feudal system, has had centralized monarchy, has had the empire, has had the local forms of political liberty, and is to-day the freest country in Asia. People sometimes use the word "cooly" of a Chinaman. There has never been a cooly in China. That term belongs to Indiamen. There is no such thing as caste in China. The poorest Chinese-boy in the land may become Prime Minister. The only advancement is through ability and examination. It is a great democratic empire, a great social condition that takes things as settled and fixed and does not pretend to overcome the obstacles in Nature which we welcome. The Chinese still live under the idea that gold and silver grow down in the earth, that things are all fixed, and that there is no use in trying to change them from their order. And the Chinaman is a man who runs to work. Just as India runs to brain, and gives itself to thought and reverie and speculation and metaphysics, the Chinese runs to muscle. He has a heavy body. He works all the time. He does not seem to have any nervous system. He can stand from six in the morning until nine at night, and iron clothes without

any weariness other than a tired body. They have not that keenness of nerve that the Anglo-Saxon has.

When we come to India, we see something of the same sort. There is another great reservoir of humanity. In India there is a great conglomeration of languages, while in China it is one language; but in India, too, we shall find that wonderful permanence of the social form among political changes. And this has also been the case in Japan. Japan prides herself on possessing the oldest dynasty of rulers in the world. To be sure, the early history of Japan would not suit the requirements of modern criticism, and we Anglo-Saxon people, who look into her chronicles and find in them all sorts of dragons and various recorded events that do not happen on the earth at the present time, and in all probability never did happen, do not take their history very much further back than one or two centuries after the Christian era. But it is the oldest political dynasty in the world, even allowing that the Mikados did not begin to reign until the second century after our era. And we find that, while there has been feudalism, centralized imperialism, the dual system, and various modifications in the political systems of the provinces, there has always been, comparatively speaking, one social system. The Japan which we know is the Japan of the feudal system, in which the great mass of the people, thirty-two out of thirty-five millions, were laborers, artizans, mechanics, merchants, all of whom were considered far below the military and literary classes called the *Samurai*, numbering about two or two and one-half millions. And the mass of the people had no rights before the law which the *Samurai*, or two-sworded men, were bound to respect.

Now, the matter comes before us as Americans in this way. Here is Asia, a country of comparatively unchanging social type and condition, while in the West there is the spirit of enterprise and change in the mastery over Nature, and the questioning and challenging of everything; and we, as a young people coming on a new continent, have thrown away many of the old social and political forms of Europe, and stand between a wise conservatism on the one side and a modified progress and freedom on the other. Now, I am sure we have something to learn from Asia. We who are as a nation only a hundred years old certainly desire to know how it is that, while Egypt, Assyria, Greece, Rome, Carthage, and all the nations of antiquity that we call ancient and whom we regard as the classic peoples, have passed away leaving only ruins and monuments behind them, China lives to-day, strong, mighty, powerful, intense in her life. What is the secret of such longevity? I believe it is their recognition of the principle contained in the commandment, "Honor thy father and thy mother,

that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." I believe that wherever the young honor the aged, wherever children obey their parents, wherever there is reverence for what is good in the past, there you have the soul and secret of national long life. To be sure, they may carry it to an extreme. They may run it into ancestor-worship, and consider it a sin to change anything that is done. But we need to learn the secret of their national perpetuity; we need as Americans to take our stand somewhere between the tendency to change and this old unchanging conservatism, where religion is run into a jungle of superstition and where great masses of the people are so poor that they never know what a full stomach is except at certain times of the year when the rice-crop comes in or mangoes are ripe. You and I who sit down to a comfortable meal three times a day can hardly understand that; but it is true that the majority of the people, by reason of their industrial condition, rarely know the sensation of being utterly free from hunger. There are places in China where the people earn five and six cents a day and have one suit of clothes the year round. In India there are a great many people who never own a suit of clothes. In Japan, which we are apt to think of as a good deal better than the average Asiatic nation,— and which, in truth, is better,— the average sum of money spent for clothes during the year is four dollars and a half, while the wages of a working-woman in the fields, on the farms, is eight or ten dollars a year with food and possibly fifteen or twenty without, and a skilled workman does not, as a rule, average over thirty or thirty-five cents a day.

Now, I claim that the United States has a genuine mission to perform in helping Asia socially, politically, and industrially; and each one of these departments is just as important as the other. Moreover, I claim that when we first began to send the American flag around the world, when we first began to have a history outside of ourselves on the high seas in Asiatic and African countries, the policy in the course inaugurated by our rulers was a good one, and has been ever since followed up; so it is true and without exaggeration that, as President Arthur denominated our country in one of his messages, "We are the great pacific power." We do not want to conquer any land in Asia,— at least not yet. We do not want to conquer any land in Africa to hold it as part of our political system. We want to trade, we want to turn an honest penny, we want to protect our citizens; and I believe in this. Though I call myself a son of Peace I believe in making the life of an American missionary or merchant or traveler just as safe at the end of the earth as it is under the golden dome here or the white dome in Washington. [*Applause.*] We

want to go over this earth to trade, and we also want to teach and enlighten. We should carry purity and love, and help men to fill their stomachs and clothe their backs and make themselves comfortable, and able to stand up in the rights of a man.

When I went out to Japan and lived in a feudal capital, — and I believe I am the only living American that ever saw the feudal system in Japan in operation, — I mean in the interior of the country, — my first impression was gained from this incident. As I walked along the street and met one of the lower classes, he stepped out of his shoes, got down on his knees, and bowed to the ground before me. My first impulse was to kick him; but I did not. I restrained myself. Also, according to an old law, no merchant, no mechanic or farmer should dare ride on a horse when a gentleman was riding by; and as I travelled through the country, when one of these would catch sight of me, even a quarter of a mile off, he would tumble off his horse as if he was shot, so as not to be caught on it. My first impulse, here again, was to take him by the neck and heels and lift him up again. But I got over that, feeling that was not the way to elevate the people, but that we should have patience, teach them nobler ideas and set them a good example.

In 1853 Commodore Matthew Perry was sent out to Japan. And by the way, when the present Mikado of Japan was born, Perry was already in his ships, and sailed from Chesapeake Bay over to Japan. There is a great deal of difference between the two Perry brothers. One fought a battle on Lake Erie, and everybody knows about him; the other fought a greater battle on the other side of the water, and people ask who he is. Well, when he was sent out in 1853, he had a good ship, one of the very best war-ships in the world, and we had the very best sailors in the world, and yet Commodore Perry, although his artillery was the best and although he had all the materials of war, only ranged his ships out over the beach at Yokohama, just so as to let the Japanese know he was not going to have any nonsense. He was going to make the life of an American sailor, when shipwrecked in Japan, safe; but he was going to do it not by threats, not by arguments of blood and powder, but by patient teaching. He meant to show those Japanese that there was a better industrial, political and social system over here in the United States than they possessed, and that they would better begin to adopt some of its features. Why? Because their system for seven hundred years had been a system of terror. The government knew daily where every man, woman and child had been during the preceding twenty-four hours. The farmer was taxed from 50 to 75 per cent. of all his produce. Two

and a half millions of people lived without paying any tax whatever, and without toil. And there was no process of law to go into the house of a high-caste man who had killed a merchant or farmer or other low-class man, provided the wearer of swords had thought the other man had insulted him; and as for the half a million of the people who were considered below humanity, why, you could cut them down and they would lie unburied for hours or days, nobody caring anything about it.

The first day I arrived in Tokio there lay a man dead in the road who had been killed in this way, whose body had not been removed. I remember going into the country, where the Prime Minister was guest at an American gentleman's house. As I knew a little Japanese I acted as interpreter. I introduced the Prime Minister to Mr. So-and-so, adding, "He is a professor in such a college;" and to "Dr. So-and-so, a medical doctor;" and to "Captain So-and-so." Shortly there came up one of the most cultivated and refined American gentlemen in Japan. "Who is this?" asked the minister. "This is Mr. So-and-so, a leading merchant in America." Up went the Prime Minister's nose. He had been in the habit of looking down on a merchant. A mechanic was considered little better than dirt. That was the result of Feudalism,—the result of keeping everything in order by terror. The government had an army of three hundred thousand spies, so that no man could tell at any moment what to do or say. He feared that his words and acts might be reported at the government office.

Perry went out there and gave them an object-lesson in modern civilization. Before he went he was a scientific man. He went all over the United States and got models of machinery; got everything that represented American arts and manufactures; got books and illustrations that showed American business, and the way it is done; got school-books and text-books and globes; got wires for an electric telegraph, sewing-machines, daguerreotype apparatus, even went down to Philadelphia and had a toy locomotive made, with its railway. He had everything that represented American commerce and our industrial system entire. He stretched the wire in Yokohama, sent telegrams in Dutch, English and Japanese; sent the little locomotive whirling round its mile track; took pictures, though some of the Japanese were afraid to have their portraits taken, because they thought a part of their spirit went into every picture. He gave them an object-lesson of what was being done in our country. One result was that there were men who petitioned the government to let them join the army, ostensibly so that if the Americans made war they could be on the spot to die for their country. It was afterwards

found out that one of those bands of three hundred men, who were sworn to die for their country, was almost all composed of skilled mechanics and men who had studied natural philosophy and mathematics and knew something about science. In their love for progress they wanted to come down to the coast, and put on a soldier's uniform, no doubt willing enough to fight and die, but with the main idea of seeing what these Americans could do.

Now, I claim that was not a mere accident. Our country is not a conquering country. Our work is therefore to teach this people. And we have taught them. For after Perry went there they opened their doors and admitted the other nations, and let the West be brought into living contact with themselves. Just see how history then moved on. Only a few years later the great Civil War of 1868, which was to Japan what the French Revolution was to France and the American Revolution to us, came on and made a new nation. And one reason why you and I ought to have so much hope that the movement in Japan to-day is something vital, and not merely on the outside, lies in the fact that long before Perry came there were men in that country who began to *inquire*. They generally got into prison for inquiring, but they inquired nevertheless. There were men who began to learn what an American rifle was, and about American military tactics, and what American geographies and histories taught. There were men who saw that Japan had fallen a great way behind, and they wanted to advance their country. There were men who searched into the morals of this country, and who wanted to know something about God. When Perry came there, the prisons were full of these men, for the government of the Tycoon was nothing but a military despotism. Long before the Americans came there, there was many a man who, in order to save his wife and children from imprisonment and attainder of treason, put his knife in his bowels and ended his life, as true a martyr as any on the Roman calendar, and as true an inquirer for light as any our country can boast.

When I arrived in Japan in 1870 I found that a gentleman of whom I had heard, who lived in the southern part of the country had sent up two or three students to attend the first school I began,— or rather, I should say, his wife sent them, for he had already lost his life — and how? In 1868, after having already urged many reforms, getting his ideas almost entirely from American books, though a few came from Europe, he tried to secure an edict from the Mikado giving the half million people who were like the pariahs of India, outcast and as despised as beasts, the right of citizenship. That was too much for the old conservatism of the swash-buckler of Japan, who did not know

anything about government except by the sword, or about any change or reform except to kill the obnoxious minister who made a new edict, or threaten to kill him unless he did pass such and such another. They could not understand this suggestion of citizenship for the lowest classes, and when they found that, in addition to his idea about making human beings out of these degraded men, women, and children, this gentleman was inquiring also what Christianity was, five of them simply set upon him and killed him on his way home from the minister's palace. And his death was only one instance of many where martyr-blood has been shed after this fashion for Japan. But when I got there I found that these students of whom I have spoken had come to my school from his province, by his direction. Some others had been sent, before he died, to this country (they were the first Japanese students to come to America), and were studying at Brunswick, N. J. And the inquirers for light and knowledge, who protested against the Tycoon and his despotism, became strong enough in course of time to band together, and in 1868 they were all ready to strike. About eight hundred of them had been armed with American rifles and drilled in American tactics. They got hold of old military text-books used in Mexico, for they knew all about Scott's march into Mexico. They had learned how Perry's guns had breached the walls at Vera Cruz, and they looked upon this country as a great military country and were accordingly surprised when Perry gave them, instead of war, blessing and peace.

But in 1868 they were ready to burst forth. They got hold of the Mikado's palace: and whoever holds the Mikado in Japan holds religion, holds politics, holds science, holds everything, for the strongest force in the Japanese system is the reverence for the throne,—their unbroken dynasty, as they call it, from ages eternal. As soon as the civil war was over, the leaders from the South —for in this case it was the Southern people that overcame the Northern—went to the Emperor, and said to him, "You must come out and down from behind the curtain where nobody can see you but your Prime Minister. You must get down and stand on the earth"—where no Mikado had ever been supposed to stand for the last two or three hundred years. "You must come out before the people. You must ride on horse-back, or walk on the earth, where the people can see you. You must listen to the merchants when they speak to you. You must give us a national army, you must give us a national navy, or you will go the way of India. That way they did not intend to go: for if there is one thing the Japanese love, it is their country, their king, and their people. There were three hundred noblemen regarded as princes. Behind them there was a con-

siderable number of men who wanted the old state of things to continue, because they did not pay any taxes. It had always been easy for them. But these brave young men and their few enlightened leaders who had studied the Dutch language, the only medium of culture in Japan for three hundred years, said, "You must pass an edict abolishing the feudal system"; and it was done. They were all ready to shed blood if necessary, but when the noblemen found out how determined these few leaders were, and that they had brains and ideas and rifles behind them, they simply yielded.

Twenty-two years have gone by, and what do we see now? We see that whereas, twenty-two years ago, there was hardly a farmer in the country that owned his own land,—though he had to work on it and pay from 50 to 75 per cent. of his crop to the government, so that in time of scarcity he almost starved and in time of plenty so-called he just barely lived,—he can now own his own farm. It is a small one; it is less than an acre on the average; but still he owns it; and the tax on it is only two and one-half per cent., which makes a great deal of difference. The farmer, too, can now prosecute the nobleman. He has his rights before the law, because this political evolution has gone on until, on the 11th of February last, the Emperor gave a Constitution most wonderful in its provisions,—granting liberty of conscience, the right to remove, freedom from search of letters and house,—in a word, making Japan freer far than Russia, yes, I may say freer than Germany.

All this has been accomplished in twenty-two years. Now let me say a word more about our own country's influence. It is true that England and Germany have been powerful factors in the *renaissance* of Japan, but I believe, if influence is measured upon the mind of the Japanese, upon the thought, upon the inquiry, it will be found that America of all the nations of the earth has had the greatest influence, because the Japanese knew that our policy was peace. Our books by hundreds have been translated, including the lives of our American Statesmen. The Constitution of the United States, when I was over there in 1874, had been translated by order of the government in three official translations, and I do not know in how many private ones. I used to see it in cheap Japanese paper, and on sale in large cities. I used to see books of ours so serious and earnest in their character that I was surprised that they should be translated and find a sale. Of course, the Japanese have their language in the style of Peter Parley of Boston. When I read their writings I can see the water-lines of Peter Parley all the way through; but there was something besides Peter Parley read. So,

while we may not expect the Japanese to become a republic or a democracy, we may see the power of American Nationality there, and perceive what a tremendous influence in Japan is rising up to sweep away dualism and feudalism and attain a united and finally representative government.

One word about the social and industrial system, and I will make way for others. The social system of Japan needs as much renovation as the political system. The old political system was terror, despotism; the new era is representative freedom under law. The socialistic Japan is very bad. When you have one divorce to every three marriages it does not speak well for the purity of the people. When you have a system of concubinage legalized in the palace, and going clear down through the nation, you do not yet find signs sufficiently encouraging as to their moral standards. When you find that a woman, despite the law, has very little chance against the whim of him who may divorce her, there is yet a great deal to be done. But we must say that, as compared with twenty-two years ago, the advance has been wonderful.

As to the industrial system. This, I take it, will be the longest for the political system to reform entirely, because the population is allocated on feudal lines. Wages continue low. The great majority of the people are still very ignorant, and it will take a long time to create those wants the satisfaction of which is so necessary to civilized life. And yet, without that reform and transition in industrial progress, I do not think Japan can keep on in her representative and comparatively republican form of government. When I see, however, the published statistics of the country,—a country which now abandons its old secrecy, and publishes in black and white everything, whether of rich or poor, moral or immoral, high or low,—and compare the Bureau of 1877 with the Bureau even of 1870, the progress has been wonderful. Already wages have increased; comforts have multiplied. The school, the law, are open to all. The newspaper is taken by people who, twenty years ago, never pretended to be able to read; and so, as we look over the progress made in twenty-two years, we may say,—for that is the text with which I started,—that while Japan owes England and Germany and France a great deal, it is to the nation that first opened to her modern arts and gave her an object-lesson in modern civilization that she owes the most. I believe that in the future, as in the past, America will be her friend and her helper; and I am sure that we are getting something in return. We are discovering something of the art instinct of the Japanese; we are seeing their marvelous refinement in the use of their fine arts, that goes down even to the people. And in all that has

thus far taken place between the two countries there has been naught but friendship and mutual help. So may it go on, while I utter my conviction that man in Japan wants first of all a new God. He needs to get rid of his superstition; needs to believe that it is right to subdue the earth and make the world of Nature serve him, instead of permitting it to be a hindrance and a block. Yea, I believe that upon every earnest man and woman of America falls the duty of doing what he or she in his or her measure can do for the social, the industrial, and even the political advancement of the nations of that great continent, to whom and to which you and I owe so much. [*Applause.*]

THE PRESIDENT:—The general subject, the Opening of the Eastern Nations to Western Influences, will be continued by other speakers with reference to other nations. We have with us on the platform a young man from India, who is at present studying in the Institute of Technology in this city with special reference to industrial education in India. He is studying particularly, I understand, the principles of electricity, and the practical application of such principles. He certainly will not carry his knowledge on that subject back to India without carrying also something of the electricity of American thought. I now introduce to you Mr. Keshav Malhar Bhat. [*Applause.*]

ADDRESS OF KESHAV MALHAR BHAT.

THE NEED OF INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION IN INDIA.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I shall try to place before you this afternoon the present needs and wants of India. This is a great and important subject, and would require much time if it were treated in all its details. As I am expected to finish this discourse in twenty minutes I will present to you briefly a few important things of which two hundred and sixty millions of the poor people of India are very badly in need.

During my stay in this blessed land of liberty I have found many ladies and gentlemen who are much interested in ancient India, and who admire and study her ancient literature; but I am very sorry to say that few seem to care to know what the India of to-day is, or what are her needs. You will say, Why, the missionaries from all Christian countries have their seats in India, and are trying to improve the condition of the people, and spend millions and millions of dollars in that line. Now, without doubting the sincerity of purpose of many of the missionaries, allow me to ask what they have done except to make converts, and to report such things as the throwing of children into the Ganges, and so on? This annoying question of the Ganges

has been asked me quite often both by intelligent and by ignorant persons, and I only answer by stating the fact that my country stands second in the world as regards population, and if this inhuman custom were in practice the Hindus would be an extinct race.

Missionaries and other travelers deliver very eloquent lectures, and write painstaking and sometimes very able essays, in which they depict the miserable condition of the half-starved and almost naked hundreds of millions of the poor people of India. They ought to know that the reason of all this is owing to the want of commercial enterprise, practical arts, and industries, together with modern appliances and the technical education which constitute the main-spring of the wealth and importance of every country. The question arises whether the merciful benefactors of all mankind, as they call themselves, the Christian missionaries (and I am not here to speak ill of the Christian missionaries) have done anything to relieve these evils. Have they tried to move the hearts of the people to raise their hands of charity for the millions of their fellow-beings who constantly suffer terribly from the want of sufficient food, which we all know is the most essential thing for human existence? I mean, have they tried to help the people of India to help themselves? On the other hand, we see that millions of dollars have been gathered by them for the erection of chapels and for spreading their doctrines. It is no wonder then that they make very poor success in India. Instead of being respected, their remedies are naturally looked upon as would be the offering of very heavy, warm and costly garments to a man in the tropics who is dying of hunger. It is not religion India wants. Her theology is very rich, and no other religion can teach her any new things or any better ideas than there are in the great and mighty Vedas.

The soil of India is very rich. She raises almost everything, but owing to the poor state of agriculture the population is starving. Therefore any help from any quarter is desirable. She is the object of pity, and needs more help than any of the other nations, inasmuch as *they* have their own governments, and consequently their natural rights are not trampled upon, and their subsistence is not eaten up by foreigners. Unfortunately, such not being the case in India, any helping hand given to her will surely please our Maker.

One of the few benefits we are getting, under the British rule, is that we are trying to shake off the non-Vedic and foolish customs that have crept into the Hindu or Vedic community. This is all the reformation that is necessary in the religion of the Hindus. I ask the missionaries of all nations to let the Vedic people alone as regards religion. They may convert all other nations to Christianity if they can, except Hindus in India. I think I must give the reason for this, or many of you will be prone to accuse me

of partiality towards my own people and indifference towards other nations. The reason is that all the nations of different religions and languages of the present time have come from the Aryan stock, and since their departure from the great truths of the Vedas they have all been floating from one faith to another for thousands of years, and now if they embrace Christianity it will be but one more faith added to their respective lists. Such, fortunately, is not the case with the Hindus. And if indeed, at present, you do not see anything better in their religion, save them for the devotedness and purity of their faith, and to keep pure a sample of the original race of all mankind. For when many of our hidden sciences shall come to light again, and civilization reaches its highest pitch, the Vedic truths will be better understood and universally recognized, and the wanderers will go back to the point whence they started. When such a happy time shall come, the then living Vedic people will be glad to receive all with open arms. The pure old Vedic religion has been corrupted in many ways and many places, and superstitions are common enough in India, as they are in Christendom. I think Christians would not like to have Christianity judged by the superstitions of the church. Do not then judge us by the follies of foolish and ignorant people.

Having no manufacturing industries or commercial activity in the country, almost all educated natives are altogether dependent on the government service, although many of them hate to serve a government that gags and that binds the hands and feet of all its employees. For this reason the natives as jurors and councillors cannot often speak what they think just and proper, because thus they would go against the opinion of the English officers and thereby incur the displeasure of their masters.

The wealth, importance and strength of India lie in the commerce and industries of the country; and if these lines are opened there are many educated natives who will devote their time and energies to the true and lasting benefit of their nation. The only thing wanting is that somehow or or other they may get a start; then I am sure they can pull on for themselves. You all know that we are under the strong and heavy yoke of the British government, and, her principal market being India, there is very little hope of getting any material help from England in renovating our native industries. What little traffic there is left, the legislative inventors in the councils both in England and in India are constantly trying to cripple. Other European countries have more or less trade for their manufactures in our country, and therefore they would not like to teach us the secrets of the practical arts. Besides this, there is another difficulty in the way of the Indian student, namely, his ignorance of the European languages, except English. From the above mentioned facts you will easily see that

there is no hope whatever of getting any succor or aid to poor India from any quarter of the old world. She can only look to the new world for help, from the generous people of this blessed republic.

I will state a few important reasons for the expectations we entertain from the people who have become so remote from us in these thousands of years, and who have so little relation with the Indian people at present, except that of fellow-men. In the first place the Indian student has the advantage of the English language. Second, America has very little market for her goods in India, and hence can lose little in teaching us the secrets of the practical arts. And third, until 1882 there were two great questions before the Indian student that prevented him from coming to this country; (1) whether the American people would be so good as to teach him the secrets of the practical arts, and (2) whether the cold climate of the country would agree with vegetarians, for we of India are vegetarians. But, friends, I am glad to say that through the kindness of the people of this city and its vicinity these difficult problems have been solved.

It was my good-fortune to first disclose these encouraging facts to my countrymen: namely, that the people of the United States are ever kind and ready to help foreigners, and that the climate is such that a vegetarian can accommodate himself to it if he is careful. Since then, hundreds of young men are *trying* to come here, dreaming of America in their sleep. But there are still some difficulties in the way, which I hope will soon be removed, and their object gained. As an example I will give you a few facts that will show you how, during the last twenty-five years, native industries have died out and thousands of artisans have been thrown out of employment. In my own city of Puna I remember there were nearly two thousand men working in one metal,—copper,—and they were well off; but the English sent sheets of copper prepared by the aid of machinery, which they could sell cheaper, and the consequence was that many people began to starve. So also, in the same city of scarcely one hundred thousand people, there were about fifty families having a small dye-house of their own and dyeing one fast red color; but the English manufacturers have snatched the bread from the mouths of so many families, the art is extinct. The same sad tale can be told of every article all over the country.

In 1882 I voluntarily set out (it is needless to say at the sacrifice of many things, and with the promise of some help from the National Association of Puna) to see whether England, or any other country, was willing to give us a helping hand and teach us practical arts. Naturally I first went to England, having letters of recommendation from Bombay merchants; but I am sorry to say that I was politely refused admittance to the manufactories. As I had

gone so far, I thought I would go to America and try there. I left England with more sorrow than I left Bombay. I landed at Boston on the 2nd of July, 1882, with a letter of introduction from Mr. H. Ballantine (who was then in Bombay) to his brother, the Rev. J. W. Ballantine of Dorchester. He received me very kindly and has been a warm friend to me. For about five months I was trying to get into factories where Turkey Red was manufactured, but was unsuccessful as I had no influential friends. I had already begun to study, at your celebrated Institute of Technology, the chemistry necessary to understand dyeing and calico-printing. At the beginning of the year 1883 a rich friend in Puna, the late Sardar B. V. Shastri of Bombay, wrote to Mr. J. H. Woodford of Boston to help me. This kind old gentleman had seen the miserable state of the people of India, and was ready to do all he could. I shall never forget his kindness towards India. Mr. Woodford persuaded Mr. John Cochrane, proprietor of Cochrane's Turkey Red and Mystic Print Works, to allow me to learn there enough of the art to start a small dye-house in India. In 1884 I went back, and, with great trouble and the assistance of some true native friends, I started a joint stock company called the Indo-American Dye-House Company. There is some history connected with this Company, but, as the time allowed me is nearly up, I reserve this for another occasion. For the present I only say that the art is in the country, and from it I hope India will soon derive benefit. Through Mr. Woodford I am thankful not only to Mr. Cochrane of Malden, but also to many factory owners who kindly gave me opportunity to go around and take notes of their several arts. Being the first Indian student to study the practical arts in America, many young men have asked me whether they can get access to any factories; among them are managers of small concerns, to improve which they are anxious to come here.

In conclusion, friends, in behalf of two hundred and sixty millions of my poor countrymen, who are starving simply for want of knowledge of the practical arts, I beg to bring their want to your kind notice. I would suggest that our people would derive much benefit from a native agency, through which the United States could import goods instead of through European firms. I would recommend also the forming here of some permanent Association of influential merchants, including the generous gentlemen who have already commenced the work of mercy towards the people of India. While I make no individual complaints (I have personally to speak of great kindness from your people), I wish to say to you that it is very hard for young men who come here from India to get well settled and to make friends. They do not know the customs of your country. They do not know about boarding-houses, and many boarding-house keepers will not take them; — they seem afraid of

their color. The young men do not know well about the rules concerning schools, and how to get access to business establishments. It is all hard and discouraging for these young men from India. I wish that you might have a Society here to which they could come when they arrive; that would make it easier for them in these little things.

I believe that the United States of America can do a great work for the education of my people, in industry and in politics as well. After my experience in your country I can more fully appreciate the opinion of your great statesman, Mr. Jefferson, than when I first read it. He was opposed to sending young men of the United States of America to England to be educated. There they were likely to receive notions of aristocracy that would make them less in sympathy with the principles that lie at the foundation of your own government. I can see that our students in this land will carry back to India ideas more helpful to the interests of all the people.

With these remarks I conclude.

A specially cordial burst of applause followed Mr. Bhat's address.

THE PRESIDENT: — Thus does the Free Religious Association send its greeting to India through our friend! Out of ancient India came Buddhism, and out of Buddhism there is growing a new religion and new education in parts of Asia. In Ceylon there is an educational movement which is now to be spoken for on our platform. We have no native from Ceylon to address us concerning that movement, but Mrs. Dr. English, of New Bedford, is well acquainted with it through correspondence with an intimate friend of hers who is resident there, and I have the pleasure now of introducing to you Mrs. Dr. S. A. English, who will speak upon that subject. [*Applause.*]

ADDRESS OF MRS. SUSAN A. ENGLISH.

THE EDUCATION OF WOMEN IN CEYLON.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Perhaps you are all well aware of the history of Ceylon, — that for the last seven hundred years her girls have had no education whatsoever save the little that has been given them by Christian missionaries. You may also know that in Ceylon, as well as in India, there is a great deal of indifference, to say the least, to missionary labor. In Ceylon the girls of the upper classes, the high-caste girls, would never be allowed to go to a missionary school. They are not even allowed to go to a sabbath-school which teaches both boys or young men and young ladies. They are not allowed to speak to or recognize a gentleman on the street, nor is a gentleman allowed to recognize a lady unless it is

his mother, his sister, his wife or child, as the case may be; and one poor fellow writes, "Don't you think we have a hard time of it here?" Some of the men have been well educated, having graduated from English colleges. I have letters from young men that many an old man might feel proud to have produced; letters that show thought, intellectual vigor and power. But they say, "we can have no wives. We cannot marry these ignorant women; we want companions." And I will tell you what they say of the Anglo-Saxon man. They say, "the Anglo-Saxon man woos and wins his wife with devotion and gallantry, defends her with chivalry,—and sinks her to slavery. We do not want that. We want companions who shall stand shoulder to shoulder with ourselves. To secure this we must have schools. We have no school where a native Singalese lady could be educated. We have no schools where even the little-ones may be sent,—unless they are of the lower classes; such are sent to missionary schools, and there they are taught what the native believes to be a terrible thing. They are taught the Christian religion."

Now, as I understand Buddhism, it is not so far removed from Christianity as most people believe. [*A voice: Hear, hear.*] There are two sides to Buddhism, there is a dark side and a bright side, just as there are to Christianity; and there are many sects there, just as there are here of Christians. But the bright side of Buddhism is this, and I think it runs parallel with Christianity,—it is that if man would reach his divinity, which they fully believe he can do, he must live a thoroughly unselfish life. I asked this friend of mine some questions, and I will give you his reply as best conveying this idea. "I cannot answer your question in the affirmative," he says, "for I cannot say I have arrived at that state where I have perfect purity of thought, perfect purity and chastity of speech and action. Until I arrive at that state I have no right to answer your question." You can see from this something of what the bright side of Buddhism is. They tell me that Christianity, as it is practised there, has led to more vice, more crime, more insanity than they ever knew before;—not because Jesus' words are false, for with one accord they say, "We believe what he uttered, and accept it, but we don't accept the interpretations that you send us. We don't believe that one man is intended for a grand and noble estate, and the other man for the devil. We don't believe that because one man has risen to a high estate, whether in wealth or intellect, while another has failed to reach the same height, but has gained, in another way, something far better,—we don't believe that those two men are as separate as the poles of the earth. We do not believe that there is one heaven for Christians and another for Buddhists. We do

not believe that there is one hell for the Christian and another for the Buddhist; but that when the law of gravity shakes the chains from our ankles, and we traverse the starry heavens, we go as universal brothers, and that we must take our seats and perform our missions in the beyond as one family instead of two or three." With all these things in mind, they come boldly forward and ask help for schools for their girls.

The dark side of Buddhism is superstition, and it is, I suppose, very prevalent among the ignorant people. Many years ago it was rife in the South. A negro, then a slave, used to tell me a great deal about "the haunts" that were out at night on the fences. Said I, "Do you believe that you are haunted?" "Oh, yes, there is a lot of haunts 'round. Be careful where you go." Now, that was Christianity sunk into superstition. So Buddhism has its superstitions. It has priests who are mere boys, perhaps ten or twelve years of age. Those boys are carried into a temple, and there they are taught certain phrases which they come out and repeat. Every man that meets one of those boys is supposed to bow in the dust to him, or be deemed a rebel from the faith. Of course, there are many men who will not do that; there are many men who have a feeling that they are akin themselves to the Eternal Source, and from that Eternal Source they can draw strength to stand alone.

You can easily understand that superstition might exist among the women, because they have never been educated even to read or write their own language. There are few of them that have been so educated. They have very few opportunities to acquire knowledge; they live in the same old way that their ancestors did. Before the Portuguese and the Dutch were there, and long before the English were there, they lived in the same way. Girls are betrothed in their cradles, and their marriage takes place, as I understand it, without the asking of anyone except the parents. One youn gman who writes me constantly says, "I am unmarried. I do not desire a wife until I can have an educated wife. It would be a very hell, as you Christians say, to live with an ignorant wife. Can't you come over and help us?" That has now been the cry for four years.

There are a few women, mostly low-caste women, who have formed a Society for Education in the island of Ceylon. Think what a magnificent stride it was for those poor downtrodden women to rise up in that island, which has been so priest-ridden, and form that society! They are trying there, in all ways, to get money, but what our friend from India said of the poverty there is true of Ceylon, as doubtless he understands. They really have not the means, and they are so eager to learn that they sent a petition to America asking us to help them. And one strong argument

that is presented why we should help them, is this: "We gave you your Jesus. We gave you all the Christianity and all the morality and all of everything that you have, ages gone by. And now you would hold up Jesus as a pattern. Do you ever realize that he was an Asiatic? Do you ever realize that the light from the East came thus to you? And now, as the last great nation in the West, won't you send the light back, thus completing the circle, the great electrical current, that shall affect all the nations of the earth and win for your Lord those things that you most do love?"

In the minds of many Buddha is misconceived. He is held to be a God. But to others Buddha stands to-day precisely as Jesus stands to you,—as a man who came to them to teach them truth. That truth has been dragged in the dust and trampled on, just as many of our truths have been. They want now to raise it from the dust, and acquire from you, besides, all that you can give. Everything, I think, that the gentleman from India uttered in regard to India is true in regard to Ceylon; — is it not, sir? [*Mr. Bhat assented.*] All such things are true, only the people of Ceylon are away from what they term the home government, that being in India. Ceylon has no representation as yet in the English legislature of India,—I think I am right in saying this. They are desirous, however, of getting it. One of my correspondents says that the English live on the fat of the land, but that the poor natives are in the employ of the government and are not allowed even to write any letters. They are dismissed from the government employment if it is ascertained that they have written at all for the press, so that they are harassed in every possible way.

To do away with insanity, to do away with selfishness, to do away with the evils that have arisen ever since they have been wallowing in the dust, is their object in the education they desire. They want an industrial education, they want a literary and scientific education. "And then," they say, "if our girls accept Christianity, well and good, but we do not want it forced upon them. We do not want them to be compelled to bow down and worship that which they know nothing about." They are perfectly willing, at the same time, that Buddhism and Christianity should go side by side, letting whichever win that can in the great moral and intellectual struggles of the nation in the great world of thought. They are willing to leave the truth of their religion to take care of itself; and it speaks well for that religion that they are thus willing to put it on trial, for it shows that they have faith in it; it shows that they have got something there which is vital with them, which we Americans know little of. How many of us believe?

We say we do, but when it comes to a critical point of belief, so that we are required absolutely to do according to our professed belief, how many of us are there that do it? [*A voice: "Hear, hear."*] Recall Jesus' words. He says, unless you love your neighbor as yourself you are no Christian; or at least that is the substance of the command given. But how many of us do it? I do not believe there are two persons in this house that can truthfully say to themselves that they do that, and carry it out; yet we call ourselves Christian. Do you hold up to me the absurdities of Buddhism? Go to your Bible and see the absurdities that pass under the guise of Christianity. For one example only, the Old Testament somewhere speaks, I think, of Jehovah measuring the pantaloons of a man, and telling just how long they shall be. This is in the book of Exodus, I believe,—perhaps some of these ministers know. And in this way we could go on and place side by side with every incongruity of Buddhism one of Christianity. Yet because we are accustomed to Christianity, because we are born in it and cradled in it, we accept it all without question. Now, I am the last one to stand here and ask you to give up Jesus. He is as dear to my soul, I think, as he is to most people; but I can see how bright is the light from other parts of the East. In reading and studying their old scriptures and books, I find much that is identical with the best in the Christian Bible: though in all religions and nations I find truth more or less covered up with the rubbish of ignorance and superstition.

One great reason that these women of Ceylon give for presuming to ask for help from American people is this: that they spring from the same source, and that our Bible says from one blood all the nations of the earth have come. They spring from the same source and are traveling to the same destiny; they are filled with the same desires and aspirations and are going on to the same home. And while we of America are all traveling onward, upward, forward, and godward, how shall we answer satisfactorily to our own minds the question, What have we done to make evil less in the world? Can we expect those sisters of ours in Ceylon to be willing to go on giving children to the world bred in ignorance, while all the rest of the world is belted around with thought? Just so long as there is a cry going up, "Give me bread," "Give me knowledge," just so long will every human soul be searched, and we shall be asked, "What have you done?" But you may say, "Ceylon is so far away geographically!" It is not as many miles away spiritually as it is from many a person to his God. But suppose it were; if you had two neighbors who were suffering, one of whom lived next door to you and had half a loaf of bread, while the other lived twenty miles away

and had not a mouthful, and had not had for five days, which would you think most in need? Which would you go quickest to help? Surely it would not be the one living next door, who had the half-loaf, but the one living twenty miles away, who had not had bread for days. Is he not your neighbor as much as the other, notwithstanding his distance? I know you will tell me, "We have our own poor and our own schools to support; there is a call on us for help every day." I know this is true. But has not God given to us largely? And have we not, as Americans, in seeking "the Federation of the World," virtually signed an agreement with ourselves and God that, inasmuch as our natural endowments are beyond those of our brothers and sisters, we will aid them? Is not that Christianity? If it is not, I do not know what Christianity is. And if those women of Ceylon hold up their hands to us and raise their voices and beg,— beg in the name of humanity and in the name of the good that has come from the East to us, asking us by all that is sacred on earth or in heaven that they may have the light that we have, is it not our duty to give it to them? our duty not only to the present, but to the generations yet unborn?—holding out our hand to this ancient isle of the sea, once called "the pearl of the Indian ocean," and helping them, that they in turn may help on the good work around the globe? Thus, by-and-by, when we come to sit above, having taken our neighbors by the hand, it will be pronounced unto us, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto these, ye did it unto the divine within you." [*Applause.*]

The President: — These appeals that come to us will doubtless touch individual hearts, and it is hoped that there may be some responses to them.

The moment has now come when we must again submit to the inevitable,— the passing of the contribution-box for the general expenses of this Convention, including the printing of the proceedings, and for any other work that the Association may do during the year. Let me say, before the committee proceed through the hall, that if any of you are not prepared to give now, your contributions can be sent at any time during the year to the Treasurer, or to the Secretary of the Association. If they are sent to the care of the Oliver Ditson Company, 451 Washington street, Boston, they will be sure to reach John C. Haynes, the Treasurer of the Association. I may say that it is hoped your contributions will be generous, since, as we have now no central office in Boston, we do not receive between the times of holding the Annual Meeting so much money, either in membership fees or donations, as we received formerly. It is important that this falling off should be made up here at the Annual Meeting.

(A selection was then rendered upon the organ.)

THE PRESIDENT: — We will now proceed with the discussion of the afternoon, by an address from Mr. G. H. Papazian of Constantinople. Allow me, because I know you will be interested in a few details concerning him personally, to tell you that he came to this country in communion with some Orthodox body, but through a change in his views soon found himself out of sympathy with them. They wished to train him for their special missionary work in Armenia or Constantinople. He is himself an Armenian, though born in Constantinople. Having thus lost his position among them, through his honesty and sincerity in expressing his views to them, some Liberal people became interested in him, and through their help he has been studying as a special student in Harvard College for two years or more. He proposes to go back to his native land to work for more liberal methods of education in that country. He will now speak to you, from his point of view, on Liberal religious thought in his part of the East. [*Applause.*]

ADDRESS OF G. H. PAPAZIAN.

LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN THE EAST.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

As I shall have to use the words East and West quite often in this speech, it may be necessary at the outset to define what I mean by the East and the West. The term "East" I shall limit to that part of Western Asia which includes the Turkish and Persian empires, together with that portion of Europe which belongs to Turkey. In this limited sense the population of the East consists of about thirty millions, of various races and nationalities, and with different religious beliefs. Of these the most important are the Turks, the Arabs and the Persians among the Mohammedans; and the Armenians, the Greeks and the Bulgarians among the Christians. The term "West" I shall use chiefly for America, though I shall have something to say of European influence as well.

Although we are dealing with but a small part of the world, it should nevertheless be borne in mind that every nation has its part in history, and, however small, has transmitted from age to age its influence in the development of our modern civilization. I call attention to this because I have heard not a few persons speak of the East as if it had nothing in common with the glorious West. Such a statement as this betrays a profound, though perhaps unconscious, ingratitude toward the age-long labors of the East, whose picturesque valleys have been the cradle of mankind and of civilization as well. As far as the religious heritage of the world is concerned, I can assert without hesitation that the East has given to humanity some of the greatest prophets with the noblest and purest aspirations. There is no organized religion in the world to-day that did

not have its origin in Asia. There Zoroaster taught his exalted conception of God, duty and immortality. There Buddha proclaimed his eternal doctrine of universal charity. There Confucius laid the foundation of all social reform by declaring his faith in the dignity of human nature. There lived Jesus, the manliest of all men, whose words of faith and righteousness have thrilled the hearts of millions and inspired them to heroic action and noble self-sacrifice. I think, myself, that Western culture may yet find some advantage and help by turning now and then to the older East.

The beginning of Western influence in the East dates back to the twelfth century, when the Crusaders flocked to Palestine for the purpose of killing Mohammedans for the glory of their God,—their way of illustrating their doctrine of brotherly love. Since the Crusades, which first opened the East and the West to mutual influence, the intercourse of commerce and literature has been working steadily to broaden their relations. Owing to this intercourse, the same forces that have been at work in Europe and America to modify the old beliefs have had their influence in the East. Among the European nations France has been the chief medium through which Western thought has exerted the greatest influence on the Eastern mind. Authors like Lamartine, Voltaire, Mirabeau, Rousseau, Victor Hugo, and Renan are widely read both by Mohammedans and by Christians. At the present time there is hardly any school, except in the primary grades, where the French language is not taught. Of late years the German and English languages also have rapidly grown in favor, thus opening the land to the liberalizing influence of the rest of Europe. An Episcopal clergyman who has recently been in the East says that these schools turn out infidels. Well, that is a matter of definition, I suppose. According to his standard I doubt if there is any believer in this audience.

Another channel of European influence is through the Catholic Missionaries, who have been established in the East for three centuries.

I cannot say that the Western influence on the East has always resulted beneficially. It must frankly be admitted that for certain horrible vices before almost unknown in the East, the so-called Christian civilization is responsible. It must be gratefully acknowledged, however, that the general trend of influence has been in the direction of enlightenment and progress. The result is a general awakening of the Eastern nations from their long sleep to a gradual consciousness of the progress of modern thought. The old faiths of the Orient, which have done more or less good in their day and are still inspiration to millions of

souls, have begun to crumble at the touch of Science's magic hand. It is interesting to see how both Mohammedans and Christians are shaking off the burdens of myth and legend elaborated by their ancestors.

One would suppose that the East would have to take the same steps in development that the West has done; but this would be a mistake. Progress is rapid in this wondrous age, and by the marvelous growth in means of communication the ends of the world have been brought together. Mind speaks to mind across continents and oceans, and every new thought soon becomes the property of the whole civilized world. Thus, the Mohammedan will not become first an Orthodox Christian, then Liberal Orthodox, then a Universalist or a Unitarian, and finally a thorough-going Rationalist. The fact is that the Mohammedan, the Persian, or the Christian, who can no longer conscientiously believe in his creed, becomes either a Liberal in religion or a pronounced skeptic.

A great question is: What has America to offer to such minds, weary of the old faiths and eager for the most advanced thought in science and religion? America has sent to us good Orthodox missionaries. Men and women have foregone the comforts of their happy New-England homes to pass their lives in those comparatively joyless lands, all for the sake of an idea. For the self-devotion and earnestness of these missionaries I have the greatest admiration. A work which has been carried on with such zeal, such earnest consecration and generosity, certainly has a claim to the recognition of humanity. To be sure, some of these missionaries are entirely unworthy of their calling, but as a rule they are men and women of high character, and their mere presence in the East, with their civilizing influence, is in itself a blessing to our land. Through their efforts schools and charities have been established, and the cause of general education has received a fresh impulse. But all these things, for which we feel so grateful to them, are considered by these missionaries mere subordinate matters, while their chief aim is to "save souls from everlasting burnings." Hence their extreme sectarianism, against which we protest forever.

First comes the Congregationalist, with his creed and his particular form of worship; and, succeeding in creating a schism, he puts up a new building for the seceders. Then comes the Presbyterian, the Methodist, the Disciples, and, last of all, the close-communion Baptist. All these build, with Western money, sectarian churches, and put up their respective machinery. And this they call their direct aim and chief purpose. For my part, I sincerely wish that they would give up their chief purpose and busy themselves with their indirect aim, which is much more important. The

chief result of these sectarian efforts is to bring strife and discord, and even division, in the community, the church and the family.

It is needless to say that the doctrine of these missionaries is Calvinism pure and simple. But I tell you, friends, that the East will never go back to the Middle Ages, never bow again at the shrine of authority. We have had and still have tyranny and despotism enough. What we want is freedom of thought and conscience from the bondage of fear and superstition. It is not only wrong, but an insult, to impose upon the intelligence of the East the crumbling creeds of the West. The Eastern mind is already too much inclined to fatalism, and there is absolutely no need of such doctrines as those of predestination, total depravity, and the like. Moreover, they have thus far entirely failed to influence the Mohammedans in the way of conversion to Christianity, and they are wasting tremendous wealth of energy and money in trying to proselyte the Christians of the Orient from one denomination to another. The same force, if rightly used, might accomplish infinitely greater and more permanent results.

The very fact that these missionaries have failed, comparatively, in their direct aim, goes to show the direction in which the East has set its face. It may be observed that this failure is chiefly due to the fact that the prevailing faith of the East is strongly monotheistic, and that this faith has received new emphasis from the monism of modern science and philosophy. Thus it does not require much reflection to see that a doctrine like that of the Trinity, for instance, will be considered as something infinitely absurd. The failure under consideration is also due, I think, to the fact that the Eastern mind is not dogmatic. It delights in mysticism, it indulges even in ritualism; but it does not care much for hard and fast dogmas. Jesus was an Oriental, a man with supreme genius for religion, but not a dogmatist in any sense of the word. The human soul is greater than any system of thought. Christianity began to degenerate only when Greek philosophy and Roman legalism took hold of it and tried to harden it into a speculative system and lifeless dogmas.

As I said before, these orthodox missionaries are doing some good in their own way, but I am convinced that the theology of these conscientious men and women disqualifies them for unsectarian work. They do not appear to have charity or tolerance enough to secure the confidence and co-operation of the educated and influential classes. It is a great pity that they should defeat their own purpose by a persistent narrowness and bigotry.

No, friends, Orthodoxy has no future in the East. In a country like Turkey, with its diverse elements, the cause

of a rational and universal religion cannot possibly be advanced by putting up new barriers of sectarianism. Until the beginning of the present century the Western mind had made almost a hobby of one of the Eastern religions alone, — Christianity,— with a supreme disregard for all others. It is exceedingly interesting, however, to see how, after expending enormous wealth and countless lives in its supposed defense, the Christian world is beginning to discover the great truth that all religions are sects of one universal Religion whose essential elements are duty and love. Such a Convention as this, whose sympathy knows no boundary lines, is, to me, one of the surest signs of a time when the universal recognition of this truth will unite mankind in one great spiritual commonwealth.

It is precisely on this broad principle of a common humanity that the East is opening to Western religious thought. For centuries the religion of creed and form has kept the different races and sects of the Orient, as well as those of the Occident, arrayed against each other. It is enough that men have hated, persecuted and killed each other in the name of religion, whose only message is, or ought to be, good-will and love. What we need now is the religion of character and freedom, which will eradicate all prejudices, racial and social, and lead mankind as fast as possible toward the ideal of human brotherhood.

For this grand work we look to the Liberals of the West. Give us rational religion, give us liberal education, the enemy of superstition!

Now that I am speaking of education, I cannot but gratefully mention Robert College in Constantinople, that truly American institution which has done incalculable good during the last twenty years as an international seat of learning. It is not under the auspices of the missionaries, and, owing to the broad administration of its noble president, Dr. George Washburn, it has commended itself as a thoroughly unsectarian institution to the sympathy of all nationalities of Turkey. There gather students from different parts of the Empire, with more or less of race prejudices and religious bigotry, and when at the end of four years they part from each other they are bound together by the ties of tenderest affection, and inspired with noble ambitions. This goes to show that the Orientals are, as a rule, hospitable to Western thought if only it be administered in the spirit of sympathy and helpfulness. They will listen to you with respect and attention if you preach to them practical piety — goodness, love, purity, righteousness; but as soon as you try to force upon them your special theology, they will persecute you. And who would not?

I am glad to acknowledge that the West seems to be

willing to repay its debt to the rising East. How it shall do this is but a question of method. It cannot be done by sectarian methods, for, as I have said, that is precisely the reason why so little of result has really been effected upon the social customs, the manners, the education, the government, and the religious life of the great Oriental nations. It is especially the duty of Liberals to take up the work of the spiritual emancipation of the East, and show to the world how the cause of truth and the progress of humanity would be greatly aided by combining toleration with enthusiasm, earnestness with patience, devotion with liberality.

I was talking the other day with a Boston lady, a Liberal, on a subject similar to this, when she gravely remarked: "I don't believe in disturbing other people's religion. I think everybody's religion is good enough for him." If this is Liberalism then we might just as well confess that it is a failure. I for one greatly prefer the admirable devotion of my Catholic sister to the complacency of such a Liberal as that. My friends, there is no gospel in *indifference.* What we have inherited from the past has come down to us through the toil of a suffering humanity. In the ethical constitution of things we are dependent on each other. From a moral point of view the East has a right to the sympathy of the West.

As one profoundly interested in the re-generation of the East, I would welcome a Liberal mission in the Turkish empire, should it come with a sympathetic recognition of the principle of reciprocity in religion. The object of such a mission should be, not conversion, but affiliation; not to engraft Puritanical forms of worship upon an Asiatic people, but to help them in their struggle for a higher and freer thought, for a deeper and purer life. It is not uniformity of worship that we should seek to establish, for, like race differences, forms of thought and ritual are characteristics of nations. Unity in diversity is the great law of the universe. In the inmost aspirations of the soul, in the common joys and sorrows of life, may be found the uniting ties of human brotherhood.

As the first thing, I would establish in Constantinople, the center of the empire, a periodical as an organ of rational religion and liberal education. Such a periodical, with no sectarian purpose, would accomplish infinitely more than any other agency with equal cost. It would require but $2000 a year to support it. Now, last year the American Board spent over $200,000 for the purpose of converting chiefly the Armenian Christians in the East. Cannot, then, the Liberals of America, who are eminently fitted for unsectarian missions, spare one-hundredth part of that sum for the diffusion of the ideas and principles so dear to them?

One thing I wish to ask at the close: Please do not send

to our people any more sectarian missionaries. Our temples, our churches, our homes and hearts are always open, however, to all true-hearted men and women who may come over to quicken and inspire us by their noble lives and broad sympathy. Let us unite in earnest, and by our efforts hasten the day when the dream of Jesus shall be realized, and the nations of the East and the West shall live together with peace and love, in the universal church of human fraternity. [*Applause.*]

THE PRESIDENT: — There is one great continent, lying southeast and south of Europe, in a corner of which, perhaps, ancient civilization first began, and yet a continent that is now to receive from modern civilization the touch of a new life, — the African continent. Our friend, Mr. Archibald Grimke, one of our own Massachusetts citizens, will speak on this topic. [*Applause.*]

ADDRESS OF ARCHIBALD H. GRIMKE.

THE OPENING UP OF AFRICA.

THE opening up of an immense unknown continent like Africa to modern civilization opens a new volume in human history. Modern civilization is destined to work wonders upon the great dark continent; and the great dark continent is destined in turn to work not less wonderfully upon modern civilization. The action of these two colossal facts upon each other will, I think, ultimately result in changes in the existing constitution of society of transcendent concern to mankind. The closing years of the nineteenth century mark the ebbing of the tide of an old and barbarous social system and the inflowing of the currents of a new and nobler time. Humanity's long-voyaging and storm-tossed ship is riding in across the bars and over the breakers with a new heaven and a new earth on board.

The unique position of Africa in the grand transformation-scene of human society which is impending I will endeavor to indicate by a preliminary sketch of the world as it was four hundred years ago. You know what the state of that far-away world was. It was a state of dynasties and despotisms. Religious freedom was unknown; civil liberty no man had tasted. All governments then were of kings, for kings, and by kings. Everywhere the internal business of nations and the administration of their foreign affairs were conducted with regard only to the dynastic interests and the ambitions of monarchs. Peoples had no rights which their rulers were bound to respect. England, which had fostered and preserved through dark and bloody centuries the principles of Constitutional liberty, was then

lying dumb and helpless at the foot of the throne of the Tudors. The nobles, up to the beginning of the Thirty Years' War, had successfully withstood the advances of despotism; but at the close of that period the great houses were broken and well nigh annihilated. The barriers were demolished and the insurgent floods of tyranny flowed swiftly in upon the nation. The conditions favored the subversion of the old political order and the erection of a new one. A new order did presently arise, in which all power in Church and State was concentrated and organized in the throne. In the hands of those masters of State-craft and royal tyranny, Henry VIII. and his ministers Wolsey and Cromwell, the limited character of the English monarchy gave place to a pure absolutism which rested like an incubus upon a broken and cowering nation. After the lapse of years and the death of Henry, the old free spirit stirred again in the soul of the English people, and the Enceladus of the Constitution turned and shook under the mountain-weight of his oppression, and the prolonged struggle of the nation with despotism began. The discovery of America was made almost simultaneously with the destruction of the old and the erection of the new monarchy. The historic coincidence is one of those strange world-happenings which have "laws as fixed as planets have." For as the strife waxed between England and her kings, the new lands beyond the sea were to furnish a refuge to the hard-pressed sons and daughters of freedom. In the new England, far away from the tyranny of the Stuarts, those self-exiled children were to plant the seeds of civil and religious liberty and lay the foundations of a mighty democratic commonwealth. The balance between the contending forces of despotism and democracy, in favor of the former, the world over, was redressed by the prodigious results which followed the landing of the Pilgrims. Measureless has been the direct and indirect influence of America in the history of Europe. The knowledge that, as a last resort if the worst should come and the cause of liberty be finally defeated by the Stuarts, there was still left a way across the ocean, must have nerved the arms and again and again rescued from despair the brave hearts of the Eliots, the Pyms, the Hampdens and Cromwells of old England. The discovery of America and the subsequent founding of a free State were thus of immense utility to the cause of civil and religious freedom throughout the world.

Will the opening up of Africa and the founding of the Congo Free State produce like effects upon human liberty in the future? The world of to-day is certainly not the world of four centuries ago: kings are a fast diminishing factor. In the great struggle between them and the people the people have conquered. National interests and ambi-

tions have almost everywhere superseded those of the dynasties. It is not the King, but public opinion, that is mighty to-day.

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new."

The Battle-ground of freedom has been transferred from the political and the religious world to the industrial, and the strife rages now not between the people and a single tyrant called king or emperor, but between the wage-classes and their employers; between consumers and the holders of natural opportunities for the production of wealth. That old time was a period of territorial consolidation, political organization and concentration. The strong fiefs had conquered and annexed the weaker ones and extended their boundaries on all sides. This consolidation of territory and concentration of political power accompanied the rise of the one-man rule, the triumph of despotism.

The present is also a period of consolidation and concentration — consolidation of individual fortunes into corporations, of corporations into gigantic combinations and trusts, the concentration of autocratic power in the hands of monopolies. Just what took place in the political world four centuries ago is taking place in the industrial world to-day — the big industrial baron is destroying the power of the smaller ones and annexing their trade to his own. On every side in the industrial world he is extending his kingdom, building up his supremacy. The movement is resulting everywhere, through all the departments of industry, in the one-man power, in the rise of industrial despotism. The age is one of material progress and development. The monarchs of the industrial world are in reality the only monarchs we now have. The political world and the religious world are but revolving satellites of this other. They reflect its moods, its will, its power. The masters of the one are the masters of the other — appearances to the contrary notwithstanding. It is not the massing of political power in monarchs which the people have now to check, for that tendency has long ago been arrested. It is the massing of industrial power in monopolies which is to-day the formidable, increasing danger which menaces human society and human liberty. It is not whether conscience shall be free, not whether the people shall be the fountain of political power, for these are to-day secondary questions. It is whether labor shall be free; whether natural opportunities shall be free. Whoever in the industrial world can say to a man, "Thus far shalt thou go, but no farther," is that man's master, and the laborer is as much a slave as if he had been bought and sold. He may have a voice in the government, he may be free to worship God

according to his own inward light, yet he is not free for he is subject to the will and the selfishness of arbitrary power in the satisfaction of his physical wants, the first and most imperious of desires. I care not who make the laws if I am allowed to control labor: I care not for popes and their bulls if I can regulate the production of wealth, create at will plenty or scarcity of the necessary and staple articles of existence. I have only to bide my time, when I shall be able to make and unmake laws to my suiting, put up and throw down popes as I please. The time, will come, as it is certainly coming, when kings and emperors and presidents, Parliaments, Congresses and Reichstags will survive as empty forms of powers that have vanished, survive as the media and instruments of the new despotism that is rising vast and titanic in the industrial world. Think not that these things are mere foolishness because the changes are not gross and visible. Despotism does not destroy the forms of freedom, it subverts the spirit. The forms remain, but while the hands are Jacob's the voice is Esau's. Long after the substance has disappeared the shell is exhibited to impose upon the people, for the builders of despotic power are in their generation wiser than the defenders of liberty. The tyranny which is now rising is peculiarly subtle and elusive. It has such marvelous powers of mimicking its surroundings, the color and character of the political and social order where it is expanding, that it is almost impossible to recognize it even where its presence is painfully felt. In a republic like our own it assumes the complexion and functions of free institutions, and thus disguised operates upon them with telling effect. We know that wolves are in the sheep-fold from the bleating and bleeding of the sheep, but the wolves are wolves in sheep's skins. What is true here is equally true of Europe: the new tyranny adapts itself everywhere to its political environments, and uses the existing order regardless of classification to consummate its usurpations and pretensions. It invades with equal facility republics and monarchies. It is this fatal gift of metamorphosis of the rising tyranny which renders the situation of the civilized world to-day in respect to liberty more perplexing and alarming than was the situation of the world four centuries ago in this regard.

Look out over Christendom at this moment. What is it you see looming above and almost shutting out every other object? Is it not the universal strife of the masses against millionaires and monopolies? Upon the bosom of the great human sea which you scan do you not remark how the tumult grows and the conflict thickens as far as eye can reach? We are in the travail of a world-crisis. And the battle is not for civil and religious liberty, but, on the part

of the many, for bread and the right to live, and, on the part of the few, for control of production and distribution, the economic key of life. Monopoly is erecting its throne in the midst of a spreading industrial empire. Presently, unless overthrown, it will acquire all the sources of wealth, all the machinery of industry, control all the exertions of labor, usurp all the functions of civil society. Then will all governments, whether city, state or national, whether in form republican or monarchical, derive their unjust powers from Monopoly, to be exercised for Monopoly, and by Monopoly. Has the young Emperor of Germany, with clearer vision than Bismarck, caught sight of this rising danger to his house and throne? Possibly he feels the premonitory hug of the huge industrial asp, which coil on coil is twisting its vast length about the German sovereignty and the German people. Let William's wisdom commend itself to others, for the struggling masses are looking with increasing suspicion and distrust upon all governments as the *particeps criminis* of the growing industrial despotism.

The battle of the working-classes of Europe for bread and the right to live has been immeasurably assisted by the immense unoccupied lands and unappropriated natural opportunities of the United States. Millions of the old world's subjects, worsted in the desperate struggle with the private owners of the land and of the natural opportunities there, have retreated across the sea to this country, where land was free and natural opportunities open to all. Here they have found the bread and the pursuit of happiness which were denied them under native skies by the pitiless laws of social selfishness and bad social adjustments. Emigration reduced the unnatural pressure of population upon subsistence, and has raised the grand average of human well-being to a height it has never before reached. Viewed as an ameliorator of social ills, a dispenser of happiness and liberty, the settlement of America is one of the greatest events in the history of the human race. It is the superlative, unapproachable fact of the nineteenth century. But there is an end to everything under the sun, and the transcendent part which America has played as a social saviour and world-liberalizer will not much longer continue, unless the unexpected comes to pass. The curtain will soon be rung down upon the mighty protagonist. For the gigantic wrongs and inedualities with which Europe is wrestling have appeared in America. The physician has caught the malignant malady of the patient. America has reached her limit of free land and natural opportunities. Her once vast public areas have become private property, her practically infinite natural opportunities and resources are in the possession of colossal landlords and monster monopolies. They bestride the nation, and the working-classes toil and

starve in the shadow of their iron power. On land capable of sustaining a thousand millions of people, sixty millions of human beings are already crowding and trampling and destroying one another in the horrible strife for bread and the right to live, because some men by craft or force or accident are in command of coignes of vantage in the industrial world, which enable them to levy upon production an oppressive and exhausting stream of tribute and exactions. They create at will artificial scarcity, and precipitate upon a sparsely peopled country an unnatural pressure of demand upon the means of subsistence.

This is the present posture of affairs in America, and as the industrial situation grows apace in gravity, "the land of the free and the home of the brave" must eventually cease to offer an asylum for the artificially produced surplus population of the old world. Its own artificially produced surplus population will erelong shut its gates to that of Europe. With the final closing of this vent will ensue unprecedented social commotions and explosions throughout the civilized world. That world is in the early stages of a tremendous social revolution, either backward toward barbarism or forward toward that ideal state of justice and equality of which the human heart in all ages has dreamed dreams and seen visions.

"But what is the correlation between all this and the opening-up of Africa?" someone is perhaps querying. I am reminded of the story of "A Dusky Genius," as told by Maurice Thompson in the April number of the *Century Magazine*. An old negro slave racks his brain to find "what air de biorology ob er singin' boa'd an' er mockin'-bird 'at feeds on er mu'berry limb, an' er possum w'at kin go out jes' like er can'le w'en yo' blow it?" He seeks the solution of this highly absurd problem from his master, an old scientist and jurist, who is positive that "there is no correlation between these simple things and the opossum question; no correlation whatever, Rack." But Rack is equally positive that "dey is er corroliation," which, after the lapse of years, he was able to establish to his own satisfaction at least, and to the immense amusement of his master. The correlation between the present state of the civilized world and the opening up of Africa is, I contend, akin to that which existed between the state of Europe four centuries ago and the discovery of America. Let me repeat Mr. Lowell's line:

> "Chances have laws as fixed as planets have."

What seemed bare of relationship at first, developed with the flight of time the closest reciprocity. History is the resultant of opposite forces. The powerful impact of despotism four hundred years ago impelled Europe away from

the wild freedom and independence of its primitive races and institutions; while the strong, steady pull and tug of the democracy of the new world brought it back part way toward that ancient freedom and independence. The throwing open to civilized man of vast new lands helps him to "see things clear and see them straight," to borrow a phrase of Matthew Arnold's. You know what a day in the country does for him who has been long immured in a city; — how it puts fresh vigor in the body, fresh vigor in the mind; how by that miracle of the blue skies and the green fields, the larger outlook of earth and cloud and sunshine, he is born again to a share of his long-lost freedom and independence. Such a renascence of life and liberty the civilized world received through the discovery of America; such a new birth, I venture to predict, it will again experience through the opening up of Africa. The Congo Free State, its settlement and development, will assist civilized man "to see things clear and see them straight."

It is this clear and straight seeing that is ultimately to reform existing social evils; that is to reset the hideous dislocations of society and civilization. A whiff of the old barbaric freedom and independence has a wonderful restorative effect upon the befuddled senses and shriveled consciousness of civilized man. The State which he founds in the wilderness of a new continent is no slavish imitation of the State which he leaves behind, but is marked by bold and original design and workmanship. In his free new home he comprehends the truth how "one good custom corrupts the world" by the accretions of human error and selfishness hardening about it into bad and unequal laws and institutions. In the primeval wilds of a new world he returns to himself, to his birthright, to his royal rank as the ruler and subduer of Nature. He masters the forests, tames the rivers, conquers the earth. He says to wild beasts and wilder men, "Thus far," and they obey. Such a new crowned sovereign will make short shrift of old, bad laws and institutions. Did not America so, and will not Africa likewise? When man is ready for a fresh advance toward his ideal republic it seems a part of the divine scheme that the first steps should be taken on virgin soil, where his feet shall not tangle in the dense undergrowth or trip against the hard and fast lines of an old social order. This, I conceive, is the supreme service which Africa shall bring to Western civilization.

What will be the influence of Western civilization upon Africa? Above all, this: it will develop the principle of African nationality. Now, Africa is divided into myriad tribes, without any power strong enough to organize them

into national units. The tribal energies of the continent are mostly wasted in a state of chronic warfare. Everything is in the savage state of flux, of violence, of insecurity. Yesterday one tribe fled before the victorious arms of another, its villages burned, its cattle and granaries swept away. In the track of the sword stalks famine, and behind famine crouches tiger-like the pestilence. To-day the victors suffer what they inflicted yesterday. It is the notion of an African brotherhood, a fatherland, that is wanting, and that is to abolish this chaos, this universal strife of tribe against tribe. It is the seed of African brotherhood, ay, human brotherhood if you please, that the West is to plant in the dark bosom of darkest Africa. The Anglo-Saxon, with his genius for organization, must begin the great work of organizing the African tribes into national units. This is the first step in their civilization, in the redemption of the continent to the religion of humanity. The state of inter-tribal warfare is the mother of the most sanguinary evils which afflict Africa. It is the mainspring of African slavery and the slave-trade. What is the motive underlying this crime against mankind? It is this: Unless I attack and kill, or capture and enslave my enemy, my enemy will attack and kill, or capture and enslave me. And who is my enemy but the members of all tribes not my own? Therefore the members of all tribes not my own I will destroy, or reduce to slavery, whenever I can. But there is a curious ceremony of blood-brotherhood by which alien tribes may become friends. I see in this savage custom the germ of African brotherhood and deliverance from the horrors of the African slave-trade. The first step toward the consolidation of tribes into States is the bringing about of relations of amity and alliance between them by the bond of blood-brotherhood.

With the rise of African brotherhood will decline not only African slavery and the slave-trade, but a brood of evils and horrors which the state of inter-tribal hostility hatches and fosters. Human sacrifice will end, for slaves furnish the hecatombs of departed chiefs. Cannibalism will cease when neighboring tribes are bound together in blood-brotherhood, and ultimately merge in a common national life. The sweet high idea of the fatherhood of God will in the fulness of time grow and blossom in the rich, consecrated ground of African brotherhood. But be not deceived, first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear: first the savage man, with his passions, then the social man, with his needs, then the spiritual man, with his yearnings. All these human wants must be satisfied, but in their order. Strong meat must not be fed to babes. The missionary who goes to preach "Jesus and him cruci-

fied," the doctrines of the Atonement and the Trinity, has begun the work of regeneration of the savage man at the wrong end. He may succeed in covering the wild soul with a thin veneer of Christianity, but precious little else has he accomplished; for under the grotesque guise is the original savage in the undisturbed enjoyment of all his original sins. I know that it is written that the first shall be last, and the last first; but in the operation by which the barbarous man rises out of his barbarous state into civilized life, the first is always first, and the last last. Men are the creatures of circumstances. If we would reform the men, we must change the circumstances, otherwise the men will remain precisely the same, preach we much or preach we little. We must attack the environment, then, making small breaches here and additions there; here a little destruction, there a little construction, until, without those who have been in need knowing it, they are in the midst of new circumstances, and are thinking and acting in unison with these circumstances. If we would divert the energies of African tribes from the waste of war we must turn these wasted energies upon other objects, the tillage of the soil, the felling of forests, the draining of swamps, the building of cities. In fine, we must enlist them in the activities and pursuits of civilized life, otherwise they will continue to go a-gunning for men. The true foreign missionary is your Yankee schoolmaster with his primer and kit of tools and an irrepressible turn for trade. In his one small head he carries all the latest editions of our nineteenth century enterprise and civilization. The gospel which he preaches is salvation by work, the only gospel which civilized man can preach to any purpose to savage man, the opinion of all the churches and missionary societies to the contrary notwithstanding.

In the wild hands that now wield the weapons of war, put the plough, the hoe, the axe, the hammer, the saw; teach them to lasso and tame and harness for the satisfaction of physical wants the wealth-producing forces of Nature. And when you have given these first lessons you have begun a glorious new volume in the history of the Dark Continent and made an end of the first eloquent act in the redemption of its dusky hordes from the barbarism of ages. Let these things be, let the song of these industrial messengers of glad tidings ring through her forests, down into her valleys, around her lakes, along her rivers and on her mountain-tops, and savage tribes will clap their hands, and million-tongued Africa shout for joy. Then indeed will Ethiopia stretch forth her soul unto God, for her dark night will be far spent and her beautiful day at hand. [*Applause.*]

THE PRESIDENT: — One slight comment occurs to me, which I hoped a single sentence in Mr. Grimke's fine essay might save me the necessity of uttering; that is, that among the things that need at once to be seen clear and straight is, how we shall prevent the importation of intoxicating liquors from Christian England, Christian Holland, and Christian Boston, into the New Africa that is opening to modern civilization. This matter certainly deserves serious and careful attention.

I do not know of anyone, friends, who can more fitly crown this discussion this afternoon than Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer, whom you will now be pleased to hear. [*Applause.*]

REMARKS OF MRS. ANNA GARLIN SPENCER.

Mr. President and Friends:

At this late hour I shall not make my speech. The address I would have made I will make to-morrow evening at our Festival. All I want to say now is just in a sentence.

It is clear, from the voices from the ends of the earth which we have heard on this platform this afternoon, voices every one of them welcome, that what they want of us is our best; not our smallness, not our bigotry, not what we need to outgrow, but what we can only give by living up to our own highest ideals. We have written large our purpose. Our fulfillment lags behind. And the only word to be said at this late hour is this: If we would meet this awful responsibility as we should, this awful responsibility to give light to them that sit in darkness; if we want to meet this responsibility as a glad opportunity of service, we must be more faithful to our own ideals; we must understand better the full import of the words we recite so glibly; we must feel the full significance of the words uttered from such a platform as this, and realize them in our lives and hearts. We must, in short, live out the great word we have spoken. The echoes of that word have reached to the ends of the earth, and the people look to us for something better than they have. We must grow in stature to fill our own ideal, and so help them. If there is any benediction, I suppose that is the benediction we need,— sacred devotion to live up to our own ideal, faith, and hope, in order that we may be ready to give to those who ask this spiritual, moral, intellectual, and industrial help. [*Applause.*]

THE PRESIDENT: — There is no need, friends, for me to give any parting words, for this is not the close of our Annual gathering though it is the close of our meeting to-day. I will simply say that you will hear, to-morrow evening, at the Festival, the completion of Mrs. Spencer's speech. She is to preside at the meeting to-morrow evening,— therefore remember the Festival. We will now bid each other a temporary good-bye.

THE BUSINESS MEETING.

At the Business Meeting of the Free Religious Association, held in the Social Hall of Tremont Temple, Thursday afternoon, May 29th, after the reading of the yearly reports of the Secretary and Treasurer, the following officers were elected for the ensuing year:

Officers for the Year 1890–1891.

President.
WILLIAM J. POTTER, New Bedford, Mass.

Vice-Presidents.
OCTAVIUS B. FROTHINGHAM, Boston, Mass.
FELIX ADLER, New York City.
GEORGE WM. CURTIS, Staten Island, N. Y.
THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON, Cambridge, Mass.
ELIZABETH B. CHACE, Providence, R. I.
GEORGE HOADLEY, Cincinnati, O.
NATHANIEL HOLMES, Cambridge, Mass.
FREDERICK DOUGLASS, Washington, D. C.
SOLOMON SCHINDLER, Boston, Mass.
EDNAH D. CHENEY, Jamaica Plain, Mass.
EDMUND MONTGOMERY, Hempstead, Texas.
MONCURE D. CONWAY, New York City.

Secretary.
D. G. CRANDON, Chelsea, Mass.

Assistant-Secretary.
Miss MARY F. EASTMAN.

Treasurer.
JOHN C. HAYNES, 451 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.

Directors — Four Years.
Rev. MINOT J. SAVAGE, Boston, Mass.
W. M. SALTER, Chicago, Ill.
ABBY MORTON DIAZ.

Three Years.
JOHN WILSON, Cambridge, Mass.
A. G. HILL, Florence, Mass.
JAMES H. WEST, Boston, Mass.

Two Years.
JOHN CURTIS, Boston, Mass.
Mrs. REBECCA WILCOX, Chelsea, Mass.
B. A. BALLOU, Providence, R. I.

One Year.
EDWIN D. MEAD, Boston, Mass.
Miss HELEN M. IRESON, Lynn, Mass.
Prof. THOMAS DAVIDSON, Orange, N. J.

Nominating Committee for 1891.
DAVID H. CLARK.
GEORGE W. STEVENS.
Mrs. JUDITH W. SMITH.

THE FESTIVAL.

SECRETARY'S REPORT.

THE Free Religious Festival this year was not held on the evening of the Convention day, as has been the custom in former years, because of circumstances over which the Festival Committee had no control; but on Thursday evening, May 29th, when a goodly number of the friends of the Association gathered in the Meionaon, Tremont Temple, not only to partake of the excellent collation furnished, but to drink in the inspiration poured forth by the enthusiastic and interesting speakers of the occasion.

It was certainly a happy thought on the part of the Chairman of the Festival Committee, to invite

MRS. ANNA GARLIN SPENCER,

of Providence, to preside, for she did it with that inimitable womanly grace which is so characteristic of her every appearance on the public platform. In assuming the duties of presiding officer, Mrs. Spencer paid tribute to the Free Religious Association for the great influence it had in delivering her from spiritual and mental bondage and making her mind receptive to the principles of religious liberty. She then called upon the "Athena Quartette," of Providence, R. I., to favor the company with one of their selections, which they did most acceptably then and at later intervals during the evening. This Quartette is made up of the able young ladies who assist Mrs. Spencer in making her Sunday services at the "Bell-Street Chapel" so attractive. Mr. Roscoe, also of Providence, a fine young baritone of wonderful sweetness, favored the company during the evening.

WILLIAM J. POTTER,

President of the Association, was the first speaker called upon. As became his position, he referred at length to the past work of the Association. There had been years of effort, years of discouragement, years of hope. But for all these things, when he heard any word of appreciation, his heart was filled with gratitude, and he thanked the kind fates that drove him into the work. Even though we may be few in numbers, he said, we are many when we come to count the strength that animates our hearts. If we should count as adherents all those who accept our principles, no hall would hold them. The Western Unitarian Conference is, in effect, a Free Religious Association, and Unitarian societies have been organized everywhere on the principles laid down in our platform over twenty years ago. That calls to my mind a resolution that was adopted at our business meeting this afternoon. It reads:

Resolved, that we commend to the members of the Free Religious Association, and to the Liberals of the East, the effort of the Western Unitarian Conference to raise a Theodore Parker Memorial Fund of $10,000 for the promotion, under the direction of that Conference, of its general work in the advance of truth, righteousness and love.

I trust, said Mr. Potter, that the substance of this resolution will be widely circulated, and that there will come from it a prompt response that shall settle the question that the Free Religious Association is vitally interested in any movement for truth, righteousness and love. I believe the spirit of Theodore Parker would say, "Let this be one of the ways in which my work may be continued."

MRS. EDNAH D. CHENEY

related something of her personal acquaintance with Theodore Parker, and then

NARCISSE CYR

was asked to tell of lay religious movements in France. When I learned of the struggle of the Liberal branch of the old reform church in the direction of liberty, he said, I realized that you had a great work to perform. There are in France three organizations having objects akin to those of the Free Religious Association. First, there is the lay religious movement, which hopes to rid the people of the priest influence. There is another association which goes beyond a free movement. It is the natural reaction from the Romish church, and attempts to overcome atheism. You hear it said that France is an atheistic country. That is a mistake. There is a vast amount of religion there. Still there is, among a certain class of people, a lack of belief in the Almighty. This league against atheism is composed of representatives of every sect, and is doing much good. From the woman's standpoint, too, France is progressing. In Paris is a woman who has attempted to do a great thing and has accomplished it. She established a review in opposition to the *Revue de la Monde*, and achieved great success. Her name is Mme. Adam, and she is a Liberal of the most liberal sort.

Rev. Alfred W. Martin next spoke, being introduced as "the radical young Unitarian minister of Chelsea, Mass." He said:

ALFRED W. MARTIN.

When I accepted the invitation of your Secretary to speak here this evening my simple desire was to express the sense of indebtedness I feel to this Association for the beneficent influence it has wrought upon the Unitarian *Movement* with which I have been identified as a minister for the past five years.

Whatever else the Unitarian *Movement* may represent, it certainly stands for free religion. It *is* free religion organized, possessing a variety of means whereby it can disseminate the principles of liberty for which Dr. Francis Abbot and his *confrères* so gloriously fought twenty-three years ago.

If this Association be judged by the standard of a religious organization it has assuredly little to show. It has no specific churches of its own, no denominational building, no rich treasury wherewith to propagate its plans, no missionaries in the field, no long list of members bound together by strong social ties. But these are not the fruits by which it desires to be known, this is not the standard by which it should be judged. Its aim has been the establishment of freedom in religion; its method has been — in the language of its esteemed President — "general agitation." And nowhere have its agitations been so successfully wrought as in the Unitarian church. Here it is that we find more explicitly than anywhere else the leavening influence which this Association has produced through its Annual Convention and Festival, its rich literature, and above all, through its inspired prophets, one of whom will always be held in grateful remembrance and highest esteem — that refined scholar and accomplished man of letters, Octavius B. Frothingham, a man whose intellectual acumen, moral courage and mental vigor make him the foremost of modern American theologians.

I am often told that this Association has had its day; that its chatter-task has been achieved, and that it must therefore be relegated to the realm of effete and lifeless reforms. But I cannot endorse the conclusion. As long as there are Unitarian ministers, as well as laymen, bound by external authority, hampered by creeds, trammeled by tradition; as long as there are men who pose as politicians of thoughts, diplomatists of ideas, jugglers with words, so long will this Association have a mission to fulfil. As long as any man or woman is restrained by outward authority, be it that of an institution, a book, or a man; as long as anyone is kept under the eye of surveillance because he entertains ideas out of harmony with popular conventional thought, so long will we who constitute the vanguard of Liberalism be called upon to utter our protest against such unseemly procedure, and insist upon it that character and not creed, principles and not prejudices, freedom and not bondage, constitute the essential basis of all religious activity and thought.

Yes, we want the principle of liberty, but we need also the spirit of love — the kind of love which our esteemed Mrs. Chant so grandly described at the morning meeting upon

this platform — the love that can sympathize, appreciate, understand; the love so purely selfless in its character that it shall make our freedom *divine*. Together with the intellectual vigor of a Frothingham let us sustain the spiritual intenseness of a Martineau, and the movement we so dearly cherish will forfeit none of its beneficent power. Only let us steer our course by the eternal star of love, holding the guiding staff of freedom in our hand, and we shall surely win our way to the heads and the hearts of all men.

The utterance of the name "FROTHINGHAM" by Mrs. Spencer was the signal for a hearty out-burst of applause. She referred, of course, to O. B. Frothingham, one of the founders, and the first President, of the Association, who is still a strong supporter of the movement, but because of physical infirmities was prevented from being present. She read the following letter received by the Chairman of the Festival Committee in answer to an invitation to be present.

118 Marlboro' St., BOSTON, May 27th, '90.

Dear Mr. Crandon:

I wish I could. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to give a little breeze to the old flag. But alas, I must say to you, as I said to Mr. Mead, that just now I am in no condition to speak or even to appear on such an occasion. I am glad that Mrs. Spencer is to preside, and that my nephew is to say a word.

Yours sincerely, O. B. FROTHINGHAM.

Mrs. Spencer, after paying a glowing tribute to the writer of the letter, in which — judging by the applause — the audience heartily joined, said it afforded her much pleasure to be able to welcome to the Free Religious platform another bearing the name of Frothingham and representing a younger generation of free-thinkers. She then called upon Mr. Paul Revere Frothingham, a nephew of O. B. Frothingham, to represent the name, which he did most creditably. Young Mr. Frothingham is assistant-pastor of Mr. Potter's church at New Bedford, Mass. He said:

PAUL REVERE FROTHINGHAM.

CLEARLY, friends, my first duty this evening is to thank you for this warm and cordial welcome. The duty is the more easy and natural to perform, as it is not difficult to recognize that the greeting is given to the *name* and not to the person; and is a tribute in remembrance of the services you have received from another, and not in expectation of anything that you are to hear from me. Indeed, I scarce know why so young a man was asked to speak to you at all to-night. My only thought upon receiving the invitation

was that a scheme had been devised for convincing people that the Free Religious body has some young blood in its veins. This being so, it brought the comforting afterthought that little more was necessary than to be introduced, and then — retire as gracefully as possible.

However that may be, your Chairman asked me to bring you a "word of cheer" this evening. Perhaps I shall not succeed in doing that; but certainly I should have been neglecting what seemed a sacred duty had I not obeyed his summons. For what this Association has meant and still means to me is beyond my power to express. It is connected so intimately with the life-work of one whose name I bear, and with whose ideas and principles I fully sympathize, that if for no other reason it would thus have claimed my interest. But there are other reasons. And if it be a "word of cheer" to you, let me here bear witness to the deep debt of gratitude that I owe to the work of this Association. Those of you who have carried on this work in the past, those of you who have fought the good fight for freedom, cannot appreciate, as can one just coming upon the stage, the source of inspiration and encouragement that it is to learn for the first time of your aims and principles. The hours are never to be forgotten when first I read the utterances from this free platform — utterances that the ears were too young to hear. They brought me that breadth of view and depth of insight into universal religion that otherwise could hardly have been gained. And what it has done for me will it not, *must* it not, do for others? I believe that the work of this Association in the past serves, and long will serve, to lead the minds of younger generations out into those fields of free, full, broad, liberal religion that are not defaced by any creedal walls, and are unobstructed by ecclesiastical superstitions.

Perhaps you will remind me, though, that it is a young man's privilege and part to look to the future and not to the past. Is there a "word of cheer," therefore, for the future? We often hear it said now-a-days that our Association is dying. Some people flatteringly assure us that its work is done. Unquestionably there is some ground for such comments. Indeed, the present position of the Association reminds me very much of the predicament in which a fashionable society woman once found herself, of whom Col. Higginson has told. She had been distinguished for her exceptional ugliness, and had always attracted a great deal of attention because of this peculiarity. (I believe she was an English woman, by the way, for we do not often indulge in such peculiarities over here.) One day, in the latter part of her life, a friend chanced to meet her and congratulated her upon looking exceptionally well. "Yes,

yes," she answered, "she feared her day was passing, for she was no longer in the full bloom of her ugliness." Doubtless the bloom of our religious ugliness has faded greatly. We are no longer looked upon as fearful heretics, nor dreaded as subverters of the moral and religious order. But if you ask me *where* that ugliness has vanished, I answer, *into the predominant features of our times*, where it lives as transcendent beauty. Is the day of the Association passing away? Perhaps; but passing into the enlightened minds and broadened reason of the age. Is our organization dying? If so, only to live again in the freer pulpits and wiser worship of the churches.

But that this transformation has been fully accomplished, I for one doubt. It may sometimes seem that it has; but the seeming is often only on the surface. Mr. Samuel Longfellow left the Free Religious platform in Tremont Temple yesterday, and went to the "Berry-Street Conference" of Unitarian ministers, that was held in the Chapel of the Arlington-Street church. Speaking at the latter place, he said that it seemed to him "like going out of one door and in at another," so similar was the spirit of the two meetings. But the similarity does not reach very far down, and would not be very generally acknowledged. It does not seem to me that the Unitarians, at least those of the East here, are as liberal as they like to fancy themselves. True, their *bark* is liberal; but their *bite* is still conservative. And as long as this is so the work of this Association cannot be considered finished. I believe then that the old principles need to be set forth with fresh energy; the old ideas forced home with more assured conviction, until they are fully and generally accepted.

My word, then, to the Association would be,— onward with renewed resolves, and upward with deepened impulse.

> "Strengthen the wavering line,
> Stablish, continue our march,
> On, to the bound of the waste,
> On, to the City of God."

F. A. HINCKLEY,

of Florence, when called upon, said: I believe in the almighty power of the tongue. There is much that has been, and will be, accomplished by the tongue. The bottom of Presbyterianism is dropping out. The bottom of Unitarianism has some serious leaks in it, and, despite the efforts of orthodox tinkers, seems likely to give way. Therefore our talk should continue. So long as there is a single human being in this community suffering from injustice, so long some work should be done to insure justice for that man. If there is here a movement asking larger

justice for women, our sympathies should be there. If there is a movement asking larger justice for labor, our sympathy should be there. It is our high privilege to do new service in the sacred cause of liberty and the rights of mankind. Given a warm heart and a persistent impulse, there is no power on earth like the almighty power of the tongue.

JENKIN LLOYD JONES.

The most liberal of the Western Unitarians had an enthusiastic representative present in Rev. Mr. Jones of Chicago, who started off with the assertion that we can do away with churches if we only have ideals high enough. If we can but pursue with devotion the free purpose, the religious experience is sure to follow. All inquiries must end in consecration. So I've been proud of the first word of your name — free — never doubting but that the religious part of it would come. It's all very well for us to talk about the bottoms falling out of denominations, but there is still a bottom in the tub of dogmatism, still considerable force in the camp of sectarianism. The battle is not all won, and the soldiers are not all dead. In the West some of us have been put on our mettle because churches bearing the name Unitarian dared to say that they stood on no narrower platform than that of truth, righteousness and love, and upon that ground were ready to listen to the enlightened words of Rabbi or Ethical Culturist, of Robert Ingersoll or the Pope of Rome. For this we are being "persecuted" in the modern way.

It was expected, up to the last minute, that Mrs. Laura Ormiston Chant would drop in at the Festival, and give us a parting word of cheer, but her engagements proved too many for her, and so, at a late hour, with general expression of satisfaction at the success of the Twenty-Third Annual Convention and Festival of the Free Religious Association of America, amidst strains of delightful music rendered by Miss Marion Osgood's Ladies' Orchestra, the company dispersed.

☞ *All friends are earnestly requested to send at least one dollar for annual membership, or* $5.00 *as Patron Members, to J. C. Haynes, Treasurer,* 451 *Washington St., Boston.*

D. G. CRANDON,
Secretary.

GENERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

ETHICS AND INDUSTRIAL REFORM.

The ethical rule may be practically stated as follows: Use no man as a means to your own ends merely, but treat him as an end in himself; or, Labor not simply for a private, but for a common good.

What changes would the application of the ethical rule bring in industry? As special schemes of law, or of the abolition of law, I cannot see that ethics commits us to either Socialism or Individualism. Does it commit us to anything in this realm? I think that it does; to two things, or rather to two thoughts,—and to all the external changes that these naturally bring in their train. The first is, to a different thought about the workingman. We do not ordinarily think of the workingman as our brother, else we should hardly be trying to buy him out at the cheapest possible rate. It is nothing abnormal, exceptional, that I have in mind — but the natural course of things so long as employers act from non-moral motives. If any of us go into business, impelled by purely business considerations, we desire, of course, to get as much for our goods as we can and to make our expenses as small as we can; the difference between the two is our profits. If we have to sell a thing for what it costs us to produce it, we have no profits; the ordinary motive of business fails. Hence we economize in every possible way; we pay as little rent as possible, as little for raw material — and as little for labor. Economically speaking, there is no difference between one and another item of our expense account: we buy iron as cheaply as we can, and also the muscular force of those who turn it into finished products; we buy cloth at the lowest possible rate, and also the hands of women or girls to sew it; if it is the railroad business, locomotives and firemen are, so far, in the same category; if it is street-car transportation, there is no difference in this respect between horses and the men who drive them.

And this would all be very well, if there were no such thing as ethical principle; it *is* all very well to our ordinary political economy, which scarcely takes account of ethical principle. But to ethics there is an immense difference between either iron or cloth or locomotives or horses and — a man; there is an infinite difference, one might say — all the difference that exists between a thing (*pace* the horses) and a person. Ethics forbids us to treat man as a thing, a commodity. A man, a workingman, is another being like ourselves, and is to be treated — to be respected and hon-

ored and loved — as we would ourselves. It may, indeed, happen that buying men's labor at the lowest possible price works no harm; sometimes the lowest price is a comparatively high one. Some kinds of skilled labor, the labor of an artist, the labor with which much mind has to mingle, may be paid as high or higher, at market rates, than it would be at the dictation of the moral sentiment. The reason is, not, as we sometimes say, that the labor is of a higher order, but because the men are few who can render it. But where there are many who can render a service they can usually be bought out cheap. Hence the deplorably low wages at which the greater proportion of unskilled labor is performed. There are hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of human beings in Chicago who hardly live as well and are not apparently as much thought of as many a rich man's horse or cat or dog. It is not thought anything wrong to pay a sewing-girl 50 cents to 75 cents a day; to pay a full-grown man $1.00 or $1.50 a day. It is all they are worth, we say. What do we mean by "worth"? That we can get some one else, perhaps a dozen others, just as cheaply. O gold, how thou mayest sophisticate the mind of man! The measure of a thing's worth (I am still using the word in an economic, not a moral sense) is what it can be sold for, not what it can be got for. What is the work of these men or girls worth to us, who employ them and are trying to make money out of them? What do we expect to sell the product for? Answer to this question will determine whether or not we are paying what the labor is worth.

The view of human labor as a commodity is so deep-grained in our civilization, all the habitudes and institutions of society are so founded upon it, religion is apparently so powerless against it, nay, so often comes out on its side, that one might almost despair of its overthrow save with the downfall of our civilization itself. Even such an event would not, I fear, overthrow it; for our civilization is not responsible for it, but it is reponsible for our civilization; it has its seat neither in laws nor in governments nor in any of the *forms* of social life, but in the untrained, unmoralized human heart. How can a man, I well know the question arises, live upright before conscience and treat men as his brothers, when the social system in which he lives is cut after such a different pattern? when selfishness rolls in such waves, in such a swirl, outside of him? I can only answer, let a man cherish the thought, even if he cannot execute it, and, as opportunity comes, let him execute it more and more. If necessity is on a man (on his actions, I mean), neither ethics nor anything else binds him, any more than a man who has no bread is bound to give bread to the starving. There are those, I suppose, in the present

distress, who are simply obliged to pay the lowest wages to their workmen; to do more would be for them financial ruin. But if one can sell the products of one's business for more than it costs to produce them, then the law of brotherhood applies; then the duty comes to raise these minimum-wages; then the obligation arises, not to prosper alone, but to make those who work for us and with us sharers in our prosperity.

The second thought to which, in the industrial realm, ethics seems to me to commit us is that we should cease to enter business itself to make money there. The supreme moral commandment is over us everywhere and in everything we do: we should care for the common interest as we do for our own. Is it paradoxical to suppose that men might enter business to serve the public welfare, that their business activity might be one department of their public duty? I have been inclined in the past to distinguish between politics (in the nobler sense) and business — and to say that while in the former sphere we should serve common ends, it is but natural and proper that in the latter we should serve only our own. But I am now convinced that business, too, should be transformed and dignified. Men enter the industrial realm, at present, for profit, and the most successful are those who reap the largest profit. The nobler idea would be to enter the same realm for service, and the most successful would be those who rendered the largest service. It is impossible that any action done for reward or selfish advantage should escape a certain taint. With what disappointment do we get a hint from Aristophanes that Sophocles,

> "Who saw life steadily and saw it whole;
> The mellow glory of the Attic stage,"

was too fond of money! Yet what reproach would this involve, what shame would there be in a poet's coining profit from the offspring of his brain, if our ordinary business ideals were true ones? On the other hand, whose mind is not lifted and moved to admiration, as he reads Orlando's words to Adam, in "As You Like It"?—

> "O good old man! how well in thee appears
> The constant service of the antique world,
> *When service sweat for duty, not for meed!*
> Thou art not for the fashion of these times,
> When none will sweat but for promotion."

If this is an ideal for servants, why is it not one for masters? If we would have our workmen work for something else than hire, why should not we work for something different in principle, too? We blame workingmen for demanding higher wages, when we are all the time striving and plotting for higher profits. We say, they don't care

for their work — it is their money they want; what do we want? No, it is ignoble all around to work for profit, for reward, with the aim of making the greatest possible amount of money for one's self; if our civilization, as is sometimes said, mainly appeals to this motive and depends upon it, it is on a low plane and must be superseded. All that a man should ask for is to be becomingly *supported in* his service (not *paid for** it); to have a salary which will enable him to live in comfort and do his work well. Profits at present in part cover this and in part go beyond it (though sometimes they fall short of it).

Hence to the extent that moral principles rule in men's minds, society will inevitably move forward toward the ideal which social reformers, which the nobler socialists hold up before us — the ideal of a society in which the profit-making system is transcended; in which men work as zealously, as intelligently, as prudently for the common good as for their own. The difficulties in the way of such an ideal are all practical; they arise from the low plane on which most men still live; as a thought, and from a moral standpoint, the ideal is infinitely superior to what now exists.

But, unless I am much mistaken, we cannot *institute* the nobler system; from the hearts of men it must come — could we but waken the universal heart, could we but clarify the universal conscience, it might come to-morrow.

William M. Salter.

* This distinction I first learned from Felix Adler.

LAW, PHYSICAL AND MORAL.

Among the many over-wrought and much-abused words in the English language, none is perhaps subject to greater stress than the little monosyllable — Law. If the space given it in the dictionaries is an index of its value, it is one of the most important words in our vocabulary. Webster gives it half a page in the unabridged edition of his dictionary — which, with one or two exceptions, is more space than is allotted to any other word; and he specifies nine distinct classes of meanings in which it is habitually used. The fourth of these classes is designated under the head of "morality," and this in turn is sub-divided: there are three different senses, according to Webster, in which the term "moral law" is used.

This is an admirable example of evolutionary differentiation in the growth of language. And herein men have unconsciously followed the habitual economy of Nature in

all her processes of development. When Nature wants to make use of a hand, a foot, a wing or a fin she does not begin *de novo*, and create or evolve a new organ; she seizes on the existing primitive digital flipper, and modifies it by the laws of selection and use, adapting it to its new purposes. So, when men need to express a new thought, they do not necessarily contrive a new word for the purpose. If there is an existing word adaptable, by proper explanation, to the new use, they are more likely to adopt it. This method has its advantages, and also its defects, both in the field of biology, and in that of philology. The advancement of life-forms is marked all along the line by imperfect adaptations, by rudimental and atrophied organs, and by consequent liabilities to disease and suffering which are exceedingly difficult to account for or justify in the old teleological conception of mechanical or fiat creation.

It is not remarkable that the application of this principle of economy in the development of language results also in some inconveniences, due to similar defects in structure and adaptation. Such inconveniences are constantly observable in the use of the word "law" — especially in the confused way in which its natural or physical and its judicial senses are often confounded. Mr. Salter has pointed out, in the June number of THE NEW IDEAL, what he regards as a similar confusion of the physical and the moral senses in which the word is used. In this, however, it appears to me, he has too sharply differentiated the one from the other; or rather, he has failed to differentiate the subjective from the objective aspects of the moral law, and by assuming it to be wholly subjective he has contrasted it too sharply with physical law, which is wholly objective in its character.

From the standpoint of the metaphysician one may, perhaps, consistently maintain that the moral law is wholly subjective: that it is identical with the sense of obligation in the individual mind, which may or may not be disregarded. But the evolutionist is compelled to recognize a corresponding objective fact or condition which is the concomitant of every such subjective state. To the evolutionist, the moral law involves rules of conduct which arise out of the relations of men with each other in society, and implies, of course, the sense of obligation which is evolved out of the necessities that have forced men to seek for the conditions on which these social relations may be maintained. The primary obligation imposed on man is to live, and to live the fullest and largest life possible. The necessities imposed on man by his social relations differentiate from this primary obligation the secondary, and therefore superior obligation from a moral point of view, to do justice to his fellow-men: to love and serve others as he loves and serves himself. Morality, in the subjective sense,

is the last-born child of the human mind; but in the objective sense, the mandates of the moral law have been enforced upon man from the beginnings of human association.

"The law of gravitation," says Mr. Salter, "is . . simply a summary and abstract statement of an actual tendency of material bodies." Very true. And the moral law, in its objective and most universal sense, is simply a summary and abstract statement of actual conditions on which men may live harmoniously together in society. In this sense, which is of far greater importance to the scientific student and teacher of morals than the subjective sense of obligation, the moral law possesses the element of constancy as a fact or tendency in common with the law of gravitation, and all other laws of the physical universe. It shows how, and under the operation of what forces, the subjective sense of obligation has been evolved in individual minds; and therefore suggests the true means of strengthening and developing it in minds where it is deficient.

In this sense, also, the moral law is self-executing, and is never disregarded in any other way than that in which the law of gravitation may be disregarded. We throw a stone into the air, and it falls upon our heads. The law of gravitation has in one sense been disregarded; but it still operates, and we suffer the penalty. So we commit an unsocial or an immoral act, and, whether ignorantly or wilfully, we suffer the penalty — not necessarily of remorse, but of deprivation of social privileges, or of actual atrophy of life-function and character. It is the fact that the moral law has been thus constantly operative, and that man has constantly experienced the results of its operation that has made him in part, and is to make him at last completely, a moral being.

Mr. Salter, indeed, admits that the moral law is something fixed and constant, but only as obligation — not as "fact" or "tendency." But nothing is more evident than that a sense of moral obligation is not "fixed" or "constant" in all individuals. It is a matter of education, inheritance and development. In no two individuals, perhaps, does it operate with equal force. In some individuals it is difficult to see that it operates at all. There was a time, doubtless, in the history of the race, when no such thing as moral obligation was recognized or experienced. The primitive obligation was purely selfish in its object and purpose. Only as man became a *thinker*, and learned to substitute secondary and ideal ends for primary, empirical and egoistic ends in the government and inspiration of his conduct, did he truly become a moral being. This history of the race, indeed,— apparent to all careful students of man in society who are not biased by metaphysical con-

ceptions of the nature of conscience, duty, etc.,— is repeated in the life-history of every individual. Nothing is more evident than that the young child is an animal, pure and simple. It has no sense of moral obligation. That comes only with experience, reflection, education and maturity of functions.

That which is fixed and constant in morals is not the subjective sense of obligation, but the objective "nature of things" which gives rise to this sense. This, it appears to me, is a far more essential part of the moral law than the sense of obligation; for in the highest condition of moral development man does not act under the compulsion of duty, but renders cheerful and willing obedience to the moral law. He does right as naturally as the birds sing and the flowers bloom — and with as little sense of obligation. Duty is not the moral law — it is only man's temporary attitude toward the moral law, as he advances from the unadulterated egoism of his first estate toward that perfect ethical status which will not need the stern mandates of the law-giver. The moral law, therefore, as Mr. Salter confesses in his last sentence, "is as fixed in the moral nature of things as gravitation is in the physical nature of things." Why, then, must we make the marked distinction between the two in our thought? Should not the distinction rather be made between the subjective and objective features of morality? — or, if we must needs clarify our language in order to indicate the more subtle distinctions of thought, between the *law* and our apprehension of it?

Lewis G. Janes.

GENERAL TOPICS.

A DOUBLE NUMBER.

To accommodate in a single issue the complete Report of the recent Free Religious Association Convention, it has been necessary to combine in one issue the July and August numbers of this Magazine. The next issue will therefore be the September number.

THE WESTERN CONFERENCE "THEODORE PARKER FUND."

Many will note with satisfaction the Western Conference Theodore Parker Resolution passed by the Free Religious Association at its recent Business Meeting, and printed at the top of page 361 of this issue. Snubbed and disowned by the parent Unitarian Association, misrepresented month after month by the Unitarian periodicals of its brethren of the older type, and from time to time wantonly betrayed in its own house by some of its children, certainly the Western Unitarian Conference has been more than heroic

in maintaining, for four or more years now, its free stand. Its independence, however painful, has been admirable; its persistence has been sublime. Though bearing the Unitarian name it has in reality stood for Free Religion. Whatever countenance and help, therefore, it is *willing to receive*, in its work, from Free Religion absolute, ought quickly and generously to be rendered now, by the unchurched Liberals of America. The meagre sum it desires for its Permanent Fund for Missionary Work ought certainly to be made up easily, if not doubled, within the time it takes to make the desire fully known throughout the country. And that it *is* now willing to permit the assistance of utter Free Religion is evident from the presence and the exhilarating speeches of Mr. Jones at the recent Free Religious Convention and Festival in Boston. Let all set to and help, even if only a small amount is sent by each. The cause is more than the *name*,—and indeed, if growing signs (among which, especially, should be included Mr. Gannett's candid discourse at the last Western Conference) count for what they seem to count, it may not be long before even the *name* shall be less compromising.

"I know thy works, and thy labor, and thy patience; and how thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars. . . . I know thy tribulation and poverty (but thou art rich). Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer. To him that overcometh will I give a white stone, and in the stone a new name written."

THE COMING HEGIRA.

The "Unitarian Year-Book" is not over-large even now. If soon the entire Western Conference goes out in a body, what progressive names will the hegira leave? Well, the dogmatists and miracle-holders will be sorrowfully happy for a little, and what remains of the American Unitarian Association may look ahead a little and console itself with the idea that, in twenty years or less,—if it live so long,—it will be painting portraits of Frothingham and Abbot and Potter and Gannett and Jones, to hang beside their recent new portrait of Parker—the man whom, less than a generation ago, they were treating with contumely for this same open-eyed vision which they again to-day disallow.

FOR THE "GLORY" OF UNITARIANISM.

It is at it again—the *Unitarian* of Ann Arbor is—if, indeed, it has ever "left off" long enough to warrant the correctness of an expression implying a "re-beginning." During the few years of its existence this esteemed religious contemporary has indulged in an amount of misrepresentation, in more than one direction, which, probably, no merely human secular or political organ could wisely

hope to equal. What the free, fine movement of the Western Unitarian Conference has suffered at its hands (in its practical, brotherly exemplification of the "purer, higher form of Christianity" for which, each month, it aspires on its title-cover?) is simply beyond belief — and all this directly in opposition to the express covenant made with its original supporters (many of whom it has since traduced), that it would never enter the field of "controversy"; while the evil which, during its history, it has attempted to individuals is of a piece with its policy towards its brethren as a body. But "all is fair in war," is doubtless its motto. "That only is fair which is in love" it seems never to have dreamed. However, its wantonness is and ever has been all for the glory of "Unitarianism," so that it must be all right — just as all manner of misrepresentation, falsity, cruelty and shame in the past has been all right because "for the glory of God"! . . . .

What a God, though, to need such bolstering! — and what Unitarianism to require such sacrifice of religion's sacred love-principle!

SCIENCE IN THE PULPIT.

A RECENT writer in the *Unitarian Review* (June) would have "science" ousted from the pulpit. We take it that what the pulpit most needs is science. True, we hear it said, how often, "It may be that 'modern science' indeed tells us better than we otherwise should know, how to live; how to get much out of life; how to make life happy and blessed both for ourselves and for our children, for our families and friends, and calls on us to work for the uplifting of the whole world — to bring peace on earth and good-will to men: but at the same time it enters, in how many ways, to destroy our spiritual peace! For instance, concerning God and concerning the future. It makes all dark to us." One of the poets speaks of

> "This age, that blots out life with question-marks,
> This nineteenth century with its knife and glass,
> That makes thought physical and thrusts far off —
> To voids sparse-sown with alienated stars —
> The heaven so neighborly with man of old."

To those of us, however, who look deeply, who study more, who dream higher dreams, science gives us back, compensates us, a hundred fold, a thousand fold, for all she takes away. Indeed, she takes away nothing that is not in some sort ghastly and woeful, while almost all that she offers is wonderful and awe-inspiring and exalting.

Who, for instance, would not be rid — gladly rid — of the weak, passionate, human-like God of the old theology, in return for the wide universe of power and order and beauty which to-day the telescope and spectroscope and micro-

scope reveal — a universe thrilled through and through with the eternal, on-working, exalting Energy? Who, reveling in knowledge of the might, the marvel, the mystery of the eternal conservation of matter and force; knowing that nothing in the universe ever is or can be destroyed, — no atom of leaf or rock or human body, no element of electricity or gravitation, of mind or soul; knowing that nothing is or ever can be anything but changed, transmuted, and generally into something better and higher: who would not give up gladly, willingly, even for such *unconscious* immortality as this of the throbbing, rhythmic atom and element, the paltry heaven of the old theology, if that heaven always must be accompanied, side by side, with a hell for even one human soul? Is there such horror, really, as many shudder at, in the thought of dreamless sleep? Well, better this, a million fold, than the future of Jonathan Edwards or Prof. Phelps. Is there such terror as many dream of, in the thought of being imprisoned, unconscious, in the viewless winds, and blown about the pendent world? or in the thought of blossoming, perchance, into life again in the petals of the lily and rose, in the gleam of the crystal, in the flash of the sun, or in the light of other loving human eyes? Well, again better this, a million fold better, than the future of Calvin and Moody and Spurgeon, with that future's great gulf eternally fixed, across which no angel of mercy may ever glide, or gentle sister waft a look of love.

And moreover, science, though it does utterly deny a God such as theology in the past has pictured, does not utterly deny the possibility — nay, it affirms the existence — of a sublime Somewhat, *in a transcendent sense* "personal" if men still cling to that word, but much more than personal, — personal, at any rate, in the lowest estimate, as the origin and incloser of human personality; a Somewhat, in infinite ways more and better than even the "Father" of Jesus' dream. Nor does it utterly deny a personal immortality. Its saddest word is a Bible word! the word of Paul: "Wait, we do not yet know. Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard." Its saddest word is the word of John: "Beloved, *now* are we the sons of God [the offspring of the Eternal Energy], *and it doth not yet appear what we shall be.*"

Rather, then, than cutting off altogether our hope, and racking our spirits only with unrest, science, it would seem, in its wider views or things; in the beauty and order it reveals throughout the infinite of space — which it reveals even in the mechanism of these our own bodies; and in the call it gives us to look up and on, vastly extends our religious conceptions. We cannot, it would seem, look up now at the stars at night, now knowing them all, as we do,

suns like ours, and seeming to hear even their rhythmic music; we cannot gaze upon the petals of a flower, or watch a blue-bird in the tree by our window, knowing *its* life a part of the All-life and as eternal as that, without excess of worshipful awe, without thoughts and dreams too deep for speech — which can be only felt.

We do not lose *anything* that is not more than made up to us. Science is but wider knowledge. Science is but coming into the Truth. And in the Truth alone can be permanent rest.

What the pulpit needs is more science, not less.

MR. CHADWICK'S HINT TO "PROGRESSIVE" UNITARIANISM.

Has Mr. Chadwick, in his recent contribution to the *Modern Science Essayist*, a covert hint to the Western "Unitarian Movement"? In his Lecture, just printed, "The Theological Method in Social Reform," occurs incidentally this sentence: "We must have less governmental meddling, less interference, less protection, more local and individual responsibility: so far the Anarchist is right,— *though childishly absurd in glorying in a name which has stood for lawlessness so long that the taint will stick to it forever.*" We leave it for our readers to carry out in full the paraphrase which should make this sentence admirably pat to the case in point, simply suggesting, as a leader, the substitution of two words: viz., for *Anarchist*, "Western Unitarian Conference"; and for *lawlessness*, "theological obliquity."

WHO?

Who is the man who "does not believe the world can be bettered"? He is generally the man well-fed, well-clothed, well-housed, with family smiling and happy about him, with money in the bank. He is seldom the poverty-stricken wretch at the mine's mouth, or on the freight-car, whose face is thin with want, whose larder at home is bare, whose children are pinched and naked.

Who is the woman who "sees no need for reform"? She is generally the woman of ease and "refinement," with novels and "art-work," and society calls, and "fashionable receptions" thronging her days. She is seldom the wan stitcher in the lonely garret, forced into the streets at night to eke out a living; or the anxious widow whom bank-absconders have swindled; or the aged mother whose sons are in prison or the asylum through intemperance.

REASON IN RELIGION.

In religion, as religion is popularly understood, there is a great deal that is to be had for nothing. It is worth that. There is nothing quite so much needed in religion as a little reason.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PROGRESSIVE THOUGHT IN CONSTANTINOPLE.

To the Editor of THE NEW IDEAL :

I am glad that you are to publish the address of Mr. Papazian at the recent Convention of the Free Religious Association. It will be the means of directing the attention of many who have not heretofore known of it to what I am sure is the important work in the interest of liberal religion which Mr. Papazian is about to undertake in Constantinople. I sincerely hope that he will have the financial assistance of those who are able to render it, in the founding of his proposed journal there.

Professor C. C. Everett of Cambridge has consented to receive contributions for Mr. Papazian's cause ; and Professor Everett, Rev. S. J. Barrows of the *Christian Register*, Mr. R. C. Humphreys, and other well-known gentlemen, constitute the present American Board of Trustees. Either of these gentlemen would be glad to give information concerning this work, which it is believed will be of signal service in the East ; and Mr. Papazian himself — his address is Cambridge — will certainly be glad to correspond with any persons concerning it, or doubtless be glad to go anywhere where he is encouraged to go to plead his cause.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

BOSTON, June 23, 1890.

BOOK NOTES.

The Mothers' Portfolio is certainly "a book for every mother," as it contains the best helps ever given, so far as we can judge, for the training of young children. Here are to be found kindergarten methods, nursery occupations, stories, music, illustrations, etc. The publishers desire agents in every town, and we think many copies should easily be sold. The book is sent postpaid for $2.25. Address Alice B. Stockham & Co., Publishers, 161 LaSalle St., Chicago.

The Twentieth Century, of New York,— Mr. Pentecost's weekly,— whose motto is, "Hear the other Side," published recently an important series of articles, among which are the following : "Why I am a Protectionist," by Van Buren Denslow ; "Why I am a Free Trader," by Prof. Wm. G. Sumner ; "Why I am a Single Taxer," by Wm. Lloyd Garrison ; "Why I am a Socialist," by Laurence Gronlund ; "Why I am a Nationalist," by Burnette G. Haskell ; "Why I am a Communist," by John Most ; "Why I am an Anarchist," by Benj. R. Tucker ; "Why I am an Individualist," by Frank Q. Stuart ; "Why I am an Opportunist," by J. W. Sullivan. *The Twentieth Century* offers these eight numbers for 25 cents. Address, 4 Warren St., New York City.

Ruby Dana. A Novel. By Mary Marsh Baker. New York : John B. Alden, 1890.

We certainly deem this an important addition to the religious novel, lately so much in vogue. Judged by the existing demand for works of a similar class, along the path already cleared by recent famous writers, this novel should command more than a passing notice. Written in a clear, though somewhat stilted style, and possessing a theme of real interest, "Ruby Dana" ought to escape the speedy oblivion that is the lot of the average novel. Ruby Dana and Paul Benjamin are both out of the common run of everyday personages, and are deeply imbued with intellectual and spiritual things. The arguments they employ *pro* and *con*, presenting the extremes on the burning questions of the day in theology, will undoubtedly call for an attentive perusal. Apart from the author's treatment of these types of character, the air of sober thought prevailing throughout the work will serve to interest those who are superior to the consumption of frivolous stuff and are attracted by something more than drawing-room wit.